

301

Karen Adams, Project Manager  
Regulatory Division  
ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS  
696 Virginia Road  
Concord, MA 01742

November 14, 2004

Dear Ms. Adams,

Please immediately extend the public comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Cape Wind project to 180 days. Any shorter time period is entirely insufficient to allow the public ample opportunity to provide input on such a lengthy and important document on a complex and controversial project.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter.

Sincerely,



Betsy Bloch  
183 South Shore Dr. Unit G  
South Yarmouth, MA. 02664

RECEIVED  
NOV 22 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION



THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS  
**ENERGY FACILITIES SITING BOARD**  
ONE SOUTH STATION  
BOSTON, MA 02110  
(617) 305-3525

307

MITT ROMNEY  
GOVERNOR

KERRY HEALEY  
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

MEMORANDUM

TO: David S. Rosenzweig, Esq., for Cape Wind Associates, LLC  
Mary E. Grover, Esq., for NSTAR Electric  
Kenneth L. Kimmel, Esq., for Town of Yarmouth  
Myron Gildesgame, for MA Ocean Sanctuaries Program  
Michael Crossen, Esq., for Alliance to Protect Nantucket Sound  
Douglas K. Wilkens, Esq., for Massachusetts Audubon Society  
David Dwork, Esq., for Save Popponesset Bay, Inc.  
Paige Graening, Esq., for Nantucket Electric Company  
Margo Fenn, for Cape Cod Commission  
Mr. Emil Masotto  
Dr. Charles Levy

FROM: M. Kathryn Sedor, Presiding Officer, Cape Wind Associates, LLC and  
Commonwealth Electric Company d/b/a NSTAR Electric, EFSB 02-2 MKS

DATE: November 15, 2004

RE: November 30, 2004 Siting Board Meeting; Notice of Intent to Present Oral  
Comments

---

As you were informed last week by telephone or letter, the Energy Facilities Siting Board will be meeting on Tuesday, November 30, 2004 to consider the Tentative Decision in this proceeding. We are now able to confirm more of the details about the Siting Board meeting.

1. The Siting Board will meet on November 30, 2004 at the offices of the Massachusetts Department of Telecommunications and Energy, One South Station, Boston, Massachusetts. The Siting Board meeting will take place in Hearing Room A. The meeting will begin at 9:30 a.m.
2. In accordance with Siting Board regulations, each party and limited participant may offer oral comments on the Tentative Decision at the Board meeting. The Siting Board intends to set a schedule that will allow for the presentation of initial and rebuttal comments by all parties and limited participants who wish to speak. The schedule will include time limits for initial and rebuttal comments that will apply to all speakers. Anyone intending to speak at the November 30 meeting must file a letter of intent to present oral comments, to be filed with the Presiding

Officer no later than **5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, November 23, 2004**. A notice of intent to present oral comments may be filed by mail at the address above or by fax at 617-443-1116.

3. Enclosed with this Memorandum is a copy of the draft agenda for the November 30 Siting Board meeting. A copy of the final agenda for the meeting, including the amount of time to be allocated for oral presentations, will be faxed to the parties and limited participants shortly after receipt of the notices of intent to present oral comment. Those parties or limited participants who have not provided Siting Board staff with a fax number will receive the final agenda by mail, unless the Presiding Officer receives a request to deliver the agenda by another means. Copies of the final agenda also will be available on November 30 for all persons attending the Siting Board meeting.

4. Any questions regarding the procedural aspects of the November 30 Siting Board meeting may be directed to the Presiding Officer, at 617-305-3525.

FAX: (617) 345-9101 TTY: (800) 323-3298

[www.mass.gov/dpu](http://www.mass.gov/dpu)

RECEIVED  
NOV 22 2004  
REGULATORY TRAFFIC



THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS  
**ENERGY FACILITIES SITING BOARD**  
ONE SOUTH STATION  
BOSTON, MA 02110  
(617) 305-3525

**MITT ROMNEY**  
GOVERNOR

**KERRY HEALEY**  
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

**MEETING OF THE ENERGY FACILITIES SITING BOARD**  
**NOVEMBER 30, 2004**

**DRAFT MEETING AGENDA**  
November 15, 2004

- I. CALL TO ORDER BY CHAIRMAN AND INTRODUCTION OF BOARD MEMBERS**
- II. CONSIDERATION OF THE TENTATIVE DECISION in EFSB 02-2, Cape Wind Associates LLC and Commonwealth Electric Company d/b/a NSTAR Electric**
  - A. Comments by Elected Officials
  - B. Presentation to the Board of the Tentative Decision and Proposed Staff Amendments, by EFSB Staff
  - C. Presentation by the Applicant, Cape Wind Associates LLC
  - D. Presentations by the Intervenors and Limited Participants
  - E. Rebuttal Presentations by Parties and Limited Participants
  - F. Siting Board Questioning of Staff, Parties, and Limited Participants
  - G. Deliberation by the Siting Board on the Tentative Decision
- III. OTHER BUSINESS**
- IV. ADJOURNMENT**

303

Nov. 19, 2004

Ms. Christine Godfrey  
Army Corps of Engineers  
696 Virginia Rte.  
Concord, MA 01742

To Army Corps of Engineers

Re: Cape Wind Project

Because the Federal government has  
no rules to guide or control offshore  
wind energy, I urge your corps to  
expand the comment period from  
60 to 90 days. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Eleanor L. Donaldson

Eleanor L. Donaldson  
100 Newbury Court, #408  
Concord, MA 01742

RECEIVED  
NOV 22 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

304

Karen Adams, Project Manager  
Regulatory Division  
ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS  
696 Virginia Road  
Concord, MA 01742

Date Nov 16, 2004

Dear Ms. Adams,

Please immediately extend the public comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Cape Wind project to 180 days. Any shorter time period is entirely insufficient to allow the public ample opportunity to provide input on such a lengthy and important document on a complex and controversial project.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Robert E. Ward

RECEIVED  
NOV 12 2004  
REGULATORY

**Mrs. Anne W. Baker**

Box 157  
Hyannis Port, MA 02647

Tel & Fax: 508 775-4028  
email: [awilbaker@mac.com](mailto:awilbaker@mac.com)

[illegible]

November 12, 2004

Ms. Christine Godfrey  
Corps of Engineers  
696 Virginia Road  
Concord, MA 01742

Dear Ms. Godfrey.

Having sent you a request to allow 180 days for public comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, I should like to make my own general comments. From the very first news of this project put forth by Cape Wind, I raised the question as to what gives the right to this group to take land that belongs to the entire country. I have spoken many times about the fact that it is an absolute necessity that there be a national policy concerning such land. Without a national policy for such lands any one or any group on any coast could do takings which would create chaos along our shore lines. The Corps of Engineers has expertise in many areas, but it is not supposed to make national policy.

There are a number of areas which do not seem to fall within the purview of the Corps of Engineers. It is not set up to judge the presence of a power plant in coastal waters about which there is no national policy and of course there are the many peripheral issues which have never been a part of the charge of the Corps.

I urge the Corps to recognize the issues which concern so many of us concerning the land taking, the placement and the viability of such a project and recognize as the US Ocean Commission has that "the Corps lacks the management breadth needed to take into account a broad range of issues."

Sincerely.

Sincerely,  
Donne W. Baker

Anne W. Baker

RECEIVED  
NOV 22 1964  
REGULATORY

11/18/04

Dear Karen Adams,

306

Please allow at least a 180-day  
comment period regarding the  
Cape Wind Farm. So far, I'm  
not convinced of its worth.

Thank you.

Francis P. Sheen

NOV 22 2004  
REGULATORY DIV.



307

$\frac{11}{18}$   
04

Ms. Christine Godfrey  
Army Corps of Engineers  
696 Virginia Road  
Concord MA 01742

Dear Ms. Godfrey,

I urge you to extend the comment period on the Cape Wind DEIS to 180 days. Given the size of the document and the fact that we are swiftly approaching the major holiday period of the year, it only seems fair to give people on each side of the proposal adequate time to review the material and reach a well-considered, non-hasty conclusion.

Thank you very sincerely for your efforts and your patience in this challenging process.

Best Thanksgiving wishes,

RECEIVED  
NOV 22 07  
Sandy Berry  
HC 61 Box 21  
Edgartown MA 02539



## **Town of Oak Bluffs**

### **Board of Selectmen**

Roger W. Wey, Chairman  
Richard D. Combra  
Gregory A. Coogan  
Michael M. Dutton  
Kerry F. Scott  
M. Casey Sharpe, Town Administrator

300

17 November 2004

Ms. Karen K. Adams,  
Regulatory Division  
Department of the Army  
New England District Corps of Engineers  
696 Virginia Road  
Concord, MA 01742-2751

### **RE: Cape Winds Associates, LLC Permit Application**

Dear Ms. Adams;

The Town of Oak Bluffs very much appreciates the opportunity to act as a consulting party in the above-referenced application and we are anxious to participate in the process. We have selected our representative, Mr. David Grunden, Oak Bluffs Shellfish Constable, who can be reached by telephone at (508) 693-0072, by e-mail at [obscallop@gis.net](mailto:obscallop@gis.net) and at this address.

Respectfully,

*Casey Sharpe*  
Casey Sharpe

pc: David Grunden

RECEIVED

NOV 22 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

309

Christine Godfrey  
Chief, Regulatory Division  
ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS  
N.E. District  
696 Virginia Road  
Concord, MA 01742

November 2004

Dear Ms. Godfrey,

Please immediately extend the public comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Cape Wind project to 180 days. Any shorter time period is entirely insufficient to allow the public ample opportunity to provide input on such a lengthy and important document on a complex and controversial project.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "F. Don Clark". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial "F" and a long, sweeping underline.

RECEIVED  
NOV 22 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

November 19, 2004

Mrs. Christine Godfrey  
Army Corps of Engineers  
696 Virginia Road.  
Concord, MA. 01742

310

RE: (DEIS) Cape Wind Project

In the absence of federal guidelines in this area, the time allowed for public comment seems insufficient. I suggest that to extend the comment period from 60 - 180 days would better serve the public interest.

Sincerely yours,  
Frances L.M. Porter

RECEIVED  
NOV 22 11:21  
REGISTRATION

November 19, 2004

Mrs. Christine Godfrey  
Army Corps of Engineers  
696 Virginia Road.  
Concord, MA. 01742

310

RE: (DEIS) Cape Wind Project

In the absence of federal guidelines in this area, the time allowed for public comment seems insufficient. I suggest that to extend the comment period from 60 - 180 days would better serve the public interest.

Sincerely yours,  
Frances L.M. Porter

RECEIVED  
NOV 22 11:11  
REGULATORY

Edmund G. Hamann  
28 Greengate Road  
Falmouth, MA 02540

311

Christine Godfrey  
Chief, Regulatory Division  
ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS  
N.E. District  
696 Virginia Road  
Concord, MA 01742

November 9, 2004

Dear Ms. Godfrey,

Please immediately extend the public comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Cape Wind project to 180 days. Any shorter time period is entirely insufficient to allow the public ample opportunity to provide input on such a lengthy and important document on a complex and controversial project.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter.

Sincerely,



RECEIVED

NOV 12 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

312

11/19/04

The Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers latest edition of its publication "Spectrum" contains an item concerning the problem with the operation of a wind farm in Denmark. Article is attached.

Operational problems associated with wind farm in Oceans demands more attention than it is getting. Aesthetic, environmental, and financial concerns are getting their share of press on a consistent basis; not so for operational problems. There are many facets to this proposal.

Each person has one major doubt about this project. This article helps to focus on one of my concerns.

Putting other concerns aside, will this project be operationally feasible over a period of time? It doesn't look that way!

Ed Sanchez


29 Silverleaf Lane  
West Yarmouth

RECEIVED

NOV 22 2004

NOVA SCOTIA

# Graphical Programming for DSP



DSP

## RIDE® software is DSP made easy.

- Complete graphical programming environment with rich library of built-in functions
- Scalable integration to Texas Instruments Code Composer Studio and Analog Devices Visual DSP++ for advanced designers
- Open-platform ANSI C source code generation for any C IDE
- Real-world integration to test with National Instruments virtual instrumentation
- Direct support for many development hardware platforms and DSP chips

Download the graphical programming for DSP white paper or request your FREE evaluation kit by visiting [www.hyperception.com/RIDE](http://www.hyperception.com/RIDE)

**HYPERCEPTION**  
A NATIONAL INSTRUMENTS COMPANY

Tel: (214) 343-8525 • Fax: (214) 343-2457  
[info@hyperception.com](mailto:info@hyperception.com) • [hyperception.com](http://hyperception.com)

© 2004 National Instruments Corporation. All rights reserved.  
Product and company names listed are trademarks or trade names of their respective companies.

## NEWS

year to produce and market large LCD panels for TVs. And in late July, the consumer-electronics giants Sony Corp. and South Korea's Samsung Electronics Co. celebrated the completion of their advanced seventh-generation joint venture production facility in South Korea for manufacturing large LCD panels. Meanwhile, Fujitsu and Hitachi have been producing plasma TVs together through their Fujitsu Hitachi Display Ltd. linkup since 1999.

Other Japanese flat-panel producers

continue to go it alone or get out of the market. Ahead of the pack is market pioneer Sharp Corp., Osaka, which launched the first LCD TV in 1987. Sharp maintains the largest global LCD-TV market share with its Aquos line, according to market researcher DisplaySearch in Austin, Texas. Pioneer Corp., Tokyo, a manufacturer of plasma panels, boosted its panel output when it took over NEC Corp.'s plasma panel business last February.

—JOHN BOYD

## Danish Wind Turbines Take Unfortunate Turn

**Problems at showcase Horns Rev project provide wind energy critics with ammunition**

The world's largest producer of wind turbines, and the whole idea of large-scale wind energy itself, suffered a setback this summer with news that all the turbines at Denmark's Horns Rev (Reef)—the biggest offshore wind farm built to date—would be moved to shore for repair and replacement of defective transformers and generators. Vestas Wind System A/S in Ringkøbing blamed harsh sea conditions for the substandard performance of equipment supplied by ABB Ltd., the Swedish-Swiss energy conglomerate headquartered in Zurich. The generator and transformer problems made it necessary to retrofit all 81 of the 2-megawatt turbines, at considerable expense.

Vestas, the world's leading wind technology supplier, installed the Horns Rev turbines in 2002, under contract with Denmark's biggest power producer, Elsam A/S in Fredericia [see photo, "Let It Blow"]. The mishap at Horns Rev is especially embarrassing because similar problems arose at the first big wind farm Vestas installed, near Copenhagen. The company had expressed confidence when erecting the Horns Rev turbines that this time things would go more smoothly.

CONTINUES ON PAGE 34



**LET IT BLOW:** A wind turbine was installed on a wind farm at Horns Rev, in the North Sea just off Denmark's southwestern coast. Now, all turbines have had to be removed for repairs.

ELSAM A/S



# NEWS

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 30

Yet to judge from *IEEE Spectrum's* reporting and observations in Denmark during late August and early September, Denmark's commitment to wind, which now supplies about 20 percent of its electricity, is unshaken. Its wind program is a point of national pride, and the manufacture of wind turbines, in this country of some 6 million people, now has a weight comparable to that of auto industries in much larger countries.

But Denmark's wind program has come under increasingly sharp criticism in places where the planned construction of wind farms is arousing the ire of residents determined to preserve landscapes and vistas. Go, for example, to the Web site maintained by Save Our Sound—an organization dedicated to blocking

construction of a large wind farm in Nantucket Sound, off Cape Cod in Massachusetts. There you'll find elaborately reasoned and documented arguments denouncing Denmark's whole wind effort.

Especially controversial are the subsidies made to Danish wind power and problems connected with grid management. It's pretty universally accepted among wind specialists that keeping the transmission system running smoothly gets tougher as wind power's share grows. This happens for a wide variety of reasons having to do both with the wind's variability and special difficulties with voltage support when power from wind is carried over long distances.

Two years ago, when *Spectrum* featured the Horns

Rev project [see "Reap the Wild Wind," October 2002], Peter Christiansen, a senior engineer with Elsam Engineering A/S, conceded that grid stability problems were serious. Contacted in September, he says nothing has happened in the meantime to change his mind.

John Eli Nielson, a senior engineer with Eltra, the organization that manages the grid in western Denmark, said that Eltra has launched an ambitious program of breaking the country's whole western grid into virtually autonomous cells. The objective is for each cell to be able to provide adequate voltage support (reactive power) to meet its own needs and to be able to restore power independently after an emergency shutdown ("blackstart").

Only Vestas CEO Svend Sigaard can comment on the unfortunate situation at Horns Rev, but he deflected all requests for an interview.

Perhaps, from Vestas's point of view, the less said, the better. True, its stock has held up well this year, and its business was up 25 percent in the first half compared with the previous year. But Vestas is facing increasingly sharp competition from a dangerous rival. General Electric Co., in Stamford, Conn., recently emerged as the world's second leading turbine supplier, having acquired Enron's wind unit and merged it into its potent Energy Systems Division, based in Atlanta. GE does not play second fiddle for long, if it can help it.

—WILLIAM SWEET

**SES** has again raised the standard for grounding and electromagnetic interference analysis software with...

**AUTOCORR PRO**

Finally, you don't need to settle for second class grounding software because of a small budget...

**RIGHT OF WAY**

- The only proven tool for computing currents and voltages caused by induction and conduction anywhere along the right-of-way.
- Automated fault simulations yield maximum interference levels such as pipeline or rail GPRs, rail-to-rail voltages, induced longitudinal & leakage currents, telecom line noise, tower GPRs, etc.
- Multiphase networks, pipe-enclosed cables, pipelines, rails or insulated & bare conductors.

**For even more capabilities, upgrade to the full power of CDEGS, which integrates grounding, electromagnetic compatibility, corona, radio noise, audible noise and lightning / surge analyses.**

**SES**

Toll Free: 1-800-668-3737 Tel: 1-514-336-2511 Fax: 1-514-336-6144 email: [info@sestech.com](mailto:info@sestech.com) web site: [www.sestech.com](http://www.sestech.com)

**Congratulations to**

**SPECTRUM**

**on 40 Years**

**of Editorial Excellence**

From your friends at:

**KCSA**  
WORLDWIDE

Public & Investor Relations, Marketing Communications

300 Second Avenue New York, NY 10017 ph 212 682 6300  
[www.kcsa.com](http://www.kcsa.com)

**BARNSTABLE COUNTY**  
**In the Year Two Thousand and Four**

313

**Resolution 04-06**

WHEREAS, The Army Corps of Engineers has issued a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) regarding the construction of 130 electricity-generating wind turbines in Nantucket Sound;

WHEREAS, The DEIS is a very substantial document containing almost 4,000 pages that discusses numerous environmental issues;

WHEREAS, The comment period for the DEIS is sixty (60) days;

WHEREAS, In order to review the DEIS, and then respond to the DEIS in a comprehensive manner, more than sixty (60) days will be required by Barnstable County to complete its review.

WHEREAS, The Assembly of Delegates is concerned about the regional environmental and economic impacts of industrial activity in Nantucket Sound.

**NOW THEREFORE,**

***BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED by the Assembly of Delegates:***

The Assembly of Delegates requests that the Army Corps of Engineers extend the comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement to at least one hundred twenty (120) days.

The foregoing Resolution was adopted by the Barnstable County Assembly of Delegates by a voice vote with 90.00% of Barnstable County Delegates present and voting at a regular meeting held on November 17, 2004.

Attested by:



Thomas P. Bernardo, Speaker  
Barnstable County Assembly of Delegates

RECEIVED  
NOV 22 2004  
REGISTRATION

November 11, 2004

314


Army Corps of Engineers  
696 Virginia Road  
Concord, MA 01742

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter is to request an extension of the comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement on the Cape Wind Project from the current 60 days to at least 180 days.

This report has taken many months to complete and is 4000 pages in length. It is unreasonable to request comments in 60 days on a matter as important as this.

Please extend the comment period to at least 180 days.

Sincerely,  
  
Dennis and Roseann Williams  
Cape Cod, Massachusetts

RECEIVED  
NOV 22 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

315

November 17, 2004

Karen K. Adams  
Army Corps Of Engineers  
696 Virginia Road  
Concord, MA 01742

Dear Ms. Adams:


I would like to register my objection to the Army Corps of Engineers' review of Cape Wind Associate, LLC's, proposal to industrialize 24 square miles of Nantucket Sound.

The massive project Cape Wind proposes is the first offshore wind energy project this country has faced. Currently, there are no federal laws that authorize the occupation of outer continental shelf lands by private developers or that regulate how and where such development is appropriate.

The federal government must first establish guidelines for the review of proposals such as Cape Wind's before any more development takes place. We must develop sensible standards that enable the appropriate federal agency to weigh the benefits of a proposed project against its costs, which potentially include harmful environmental impacts, negative effects on the affected region's economy and degradation of an area's aesthetic values.

These public resources belong to all of us, and it is imperative that sensible laws be passed before any projects are approved. Wealthy private developers should not determine how or where the outer continental shelf will be developed. Without an established process by which the Army Corps of Engineers, or any other federal agency, can objectively and competently review these proposals, any consideration of Cape Wind's proposed wind plant should cease. Thank you for your consideration of this issue.

Sincerely,



Barbara A. Fay  
332 Walnut Street  
Wellesley, MA 02481

RECEIVED

NOV 22 2004

REGULATORY DIV.

**Adams, Karen K NAE**

---

**From:** Daniel Ciarcia [ciarcia@ieee.org]  
**Sent:** Sunday, November 21, 2004 9:03 AM  
**To:** Energy, Wind  
**Subject:** Cape Wind Project

316

November 21, 2004

Karen Kirk-Adams  
Cape Wind Energy EIS Project  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
New England District  
696 Virginia Road  
Concord, MA 01742-2751

Dear Karen Kirk-Adams:

I am writing to you in reference to the Cape Wind project to build a wind farm off of the coast of Cape Cod. I have no affiliation with CapeWind and will not gain personally by the project, but, I am writing to express my strong support for building the wind farm.

The wind farm is the most sensible project proposal to occur in this area in a long, long time. It has so many benefits and minimal costs. It will, of course, provide clean power generation to a large body of population. It will be a fantastic project to prove that clean energy can be acquired in a way that is pleasing to the public and financially sensible. It will reduce the chance of another horrific oil spill from occurring off the beaches of Cape Cod.

I may not live on Cape Cod, however, I am a frequent visitor, and, I have many family members who live on Cape Cod. The project will only enhance my personal experience when visiting the Cape, knowing that the electricity will be created by clean energy means. Also, I envision the view of the wind farm to be unique, attractive, and, an additional reason to enjoy Cape Cod. For my family who have both permanent and part-time residences on the cape, they will benefit from a higher air quality and a reduced risk of oil spills.

It is hard to understand why some people are opposed to this project. Surely, those individuals are not looking objectively at the facts. In addition to the environmental gains this project will make, it provides an opportunity for the local economy to make gains. Jobs will be created by this project, and, even more important, innovations will be made since this will bring engineering progress. The windmills that dot the horizon will surely be an appealing and attractive addition. The CapeWind farm has the potential to provide the same sense of cultural identity and tourist attraction as many European windmills enjoy.

I am looking forward to the wind farm being constructed. It will be a wonderful day when the switch is turned on that starts electricity flowing into Cape Cod from the windmills.

Sincerely,

Daniel Ciarcia  
66 Londonderry Road  
Windham, NH 03087-1124

Adams, Karen K NAE

---

**From:** Alix Nelson [alixnelson@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Sunday, November 21, 2004 12:55 PM  
**To:** Energy, Wind  
**Subject:** Yes to the Wind Farm

317

I am definitely in favor of the Wind Farm--the notion that anything innovative is automatically resisted by a vocal portion of the population (on a variety of specious grounds) who dread change is reflected here in the Save Our Sound propaganda, and does not reflect the thinking of those of us--quite sizable in number--who welcome the relief that wind power would bring to our reliance on oil, and to our pocketbooks as fuel consumers. The Wind Farm has passed the environmental tests that are necessary, and it is time to go ahead and build them--the sooner the better. I think they will add to the appeal of our area, not detract from it--they actually will be an asset to tourism, and to elevating the consciousness of the nation about the desirability of alternate fuels. Thanks!

Alix Nelson-Frick  
P.O.Box 2360  
Nantucket, MA  
02584  
(508) 228-2881  
alixnelson@comcast.net

**Adams, Karen K NAE**

---

**From:** Don Schwinn [donschwinn@alltel.net]  
**Sent:** Sunday, November 21, 2004 11:38 AM  
**To:** Energy, Wind  
**Subject:** Extension of Review Period

318

I have ordered a copy of the CD containing the full EIS. I understand it is about 4000 pages long.

With the Holidays intervening, there isn't any way I can review such a document by January 10th.

Would you please extend the deadline at least another 90 days to allow enough time to review the report and formulate my comments.

Thank you.

Donald E. Schwinn  
Cotuit, Mass resident

319

**Adams, Karen K NAE**

---

**From:** FIBCape@aol.com  
**Sent:** Sunday, November 21, 2004 11:00 AM  
**To:** Energy, Wind  
**Subject:** Cape Wind Energy EIS Project

November 21, 2004

To:

Karen Kirk-Adams

Cape Wind Energy EIS Project

New England District

696 Virginia Road

Concord, MA 01742-2751

E-mail: [Wind.energy@usace.army.mil](mailto:Wind.energy@usace.army.mil).

From:

Francis I. Broadhurst

88 Stoney Cliff Road

Centerville, MA 02632

Tel: 508-775-5308

E-Mail: [FIBcape@aol.com](mailto:FIBcape@aol.com)

Dear Ms Kirk Adams:

I am writing to applaud the Army Corps of Engineers for not caving in to extreme political pressure on your Draft Environmental Impact Statement on the Nantucket Sound Wind Park project. I have read the executive summary and I find it complete and thorough in every aspect.

Please do not extend the public comment period beyond January 10, 2005. We are rapidly running out of time to build offshore wind power generating projects that can bring a cleaner environment and us closer to energy independence.

My interest in alternative energy sources goes back to the time I worked for former

11/26/2004



Massachusetts Congressman Hastings Keith who was always fighting for ways to bring affordable power to the Northeast which has few energy resources. In those days New England states were subject to an oil import tax that subsidized our oil producing states and drove the cost of fuel up for homeowners, business, industry and municipalities.

Mr. Keith's last report to the Congress was delivered in January, 1973 entitled "Over a Barrel" which warned of economic disaster for the United States if the Oil Producing and Exporting Countries (OPEC) decided to "turn off the spigot" on exports to the United States.

Then chairman of the House Commerce Committee Harley Staggers (who hailed from an oil producing state) refused to print and distribute the report which Mr. Keith wrote after paying a staff member out of his own pocket to help him with the exhaustive study which took them to Europe, Africa and the Middle East. He saw the European nations moving full tilt into nuclear power generated electricity while our nuclear development was put on hold.

Mr. Keith pleaded for a National Energy Policy to break our dependence on dictatorships and monarchies in OPEC and create energy independence for the United States. Among the alternatives he proposed was development of wind generated electrical power then in its infancy.

Today Europe is again leading the United States in the development of wind generated electrical power and the international conglomerate Siemens has entered the field to compete with GE for a share of the growing market. Wind power has obviously become feasible

Rep. Keith's warnings went unheeded and as his former colleague Congressman VanDeerlin (D-California) wrote in 1973, Mr. Keith warned about the power OPEC could exert long before any of us knew what OPEC was. We soon learned. The Arab Oil Embargo in 1973 nearly brought our national economy to its knees. New England states suffered incredible economic losses and saw thousands of jobs flee to states where the energy supply was stable and local. All energy costs, particularly electrical power, went through the roof forcing homeowners into bankruptcy.

The opponents of the Cape Wind project have failed on every point to make a case against construction of the project. Your excellent draft EIS has shattered all the many myths concocted by the Alliance to Protect Nantucket Sound and answered all of their reasonable doubts.

They opposed construction of the data collection tower essential for sound scientific research. They didn't want any scientific evidence that might contradict their distortions and outright deceptions.

Now they refuse to accept the draft report for what it is—an unbiased, independent and thorough analysis of the project from every scientific, geological, social and economic angle one could conceive. Instead, the Alliance and their allies have accused the Corps of shilling for Cape Wind.

It is a specious nonsense. Their charge that scientists and other specialists who participated in the exhaustive review were "paid agents" of Cape Wind is demeaning, nasty and untrue.

You and your staff have exhibited great courage in delivering the draft report in the face of tremendous opposition by very powerful political figures in the U.S. Congress, the Massachusetts's state house and local town halls all of which expressed opposition to the project long before any facts were in. This kind of myopic prejudice has added nothing to our quest for energy independence and has only funneled money to public relations flack and well paid lawyers who are clever, determined and wrong.

As a reporter I covered the massive oil spills that have occurred around Cape Cod from the disastrous sinking of the Barge Florida to the Argo Merchant sinking on Nantucket Shoal. I have been witness to many minor but always damaging oil spills in the Cape Cod Canal, Buzzards Bay, Nantucket Sound and other places where fuel oil is transported over water.

But worse yet is the fact that in order to protect the flow of OPEC oil and gas into the United States we must commit our Military Forces into situations where too many of them are killed. The sooner we can reach the point where we are no longer dependent on foreign sources of fuel, the better off we will be.

Our Governor Mitt Romney has failed to understand the need to get started on this project which your draft EIS indicates meets all the difficult tests the Corps has developed to guarantee environmental safety.

The question he must answer is: "If not here, where? If not now, when."

The economic section of the draft EIS shows how much the New England economy can benefit from construction and operation of the Cape Wind Project if it goes forward in Nantucket Sound.

Those who say wind parks should be located on land in remote places show a blatant disregard for physics and economic reality. Power cannot be transmitted to New England from the windy reaches of our Southwest or the Great Prairies. And if wind parks are sited in these areas, they will stimulate growth there and job losses on the seaboard states. Business and Industry fled New England for cheaper, more stable power in the past and will continue to do so in the future if we do not take action to develop wind generated electrical power locally.

I am sorry that I have taken so much space to tell you what I know and believe.

In sum, please do not extend the time for public comment beyond January 10<sup>th</sup> and please watch your back. The powerful old bulls in the Congress who are less interested in the public good may send you packing to some distant post where you can do no harm to their vested interests and political friends.

You deserve a medal for working on the public's behalf against the multi-million dollar campaign funded by the few to benefit the few and ignore the needs of New England and the Nation.

In the last three years I have written extensively in support of the Nantucket Sound Wind Park as a freelance writer for the Cape Cod Times (which opposes the project), Cape Cod Today (an on-line newspaper) and Cape and Islands NPR in Woods Hole. I have covered the region as a newspaperman, broadcaster in radio and television and as a columnist since 1964 and am still at it. There is too much to do and too little time to do it all.

I hope to live long enough to see the United States take a positive step toward energy independence. Let it begin with the Cape Wind project here on Cape Cod which produced the famous Otis family who helped foment the American Revolution that brought us political independence from European rule in the 18<sup>th</sup> Century.

Respectfully yours

Francis I. Broadhurst

88 Stoney Cliff Road

Centerville, MA 02632

Tel: 508-775-5308

Email: FIBcape@aol.com

11/26/2004

**Adams, Karen K NAE**

---

**From:** NA3512@aol.com  
**Sent:** Sunday, November 21, 2004 8:17 PM  
**To:** Energy, Wind  
**Subject:** Nantucket Sound

"Even enormous wind tower tracts are unlikely to provide significant amounts of reliable, quality, cost-effective electricity. And they will become unpopular. The invasion of hordes of ecosystem-demanding towers pocking the seascape will be seen as visual and ecological blights." (SOS)

Dear Ms. Adams:

The industrialization of Nantucket Sound will be a monumental disaster, and it will have an extreme negative impact on all of us who appreciate the Sound as the natural "National Treasure" that we see it to be. We cannot just give it away to private development. Listen to the arguments against this endeavor. Visualize what you can see happening to Nantucket Sound, if you are not vigilant about its protection. The cost of this project, its subsidy, for the amount of output, is not cost effective to either the consumer or the taxpayer. Please stop this aberration before it proceeds any further. The only winners in this commercial enterprise are Jim Gordon and his constituents.

To quote Cindy Lowry and a recent article in the Cape Cod Times: "One of the most ludicrous arguments put forth by supporters of the proposed wind farm is that the project should go forward even if Congress fails to enact a comprehensive ocean policy that identifies appropriate and inappropriate places to build offshore facilities. That's like saying, "OK, we know we need a long-range master plan for our oceans, but, what the heck, let's go ahead with this industrial facility on Nantucket Sound and then we'll figure out what to do." Why do supporters of the wind farm feel that this country is so desperate for offshore alternative energy that they are willing to sacrifice Nantucket Sound? Why can't we achieve both goals -- develop alternative energy and protect our oceans -- through proper procedures.

"Those procedures are nowhere in evidence for the review of the Cape Wind project," said Cindy Lowry, director of The Oceans Public Trust Initiative. "The oceans off the coast of the United States are the public heritage of all citizens, and the federal government violates the most basic principles of environmental law when it threatens to give them away to a single developer for personal gain without authorization from Congress to do so."

Lowry said she is concerned that what's happening on Nantucket

Sound is just the first step in an effort to open up the oceans to development.

"Make no mistake about it; this permit application for wind energy is the proverbial Pandora's box," she said. "It threatens to open the door to a massive giveaway of federal lands with no compensation to the taxpayer or adequate environmental review."

Help us stop this flashing nightmare from becoming reality.

Sincerely,

Nola A. Assad, Capt., USCG, OUPV  
271 Setucket Rd.  
Yarmouth Port, MA 02675  
[NA3512@aol.com](mailto:NA3512@aol.com)

**Adams, Karen K NAE**

---

**From:** Sparkes, L&K [sparkes@prexar.com]  
**Sent:** Sunday, November 21, 2004 8:38 PM  
**To:** Energy, Wind  
**Subject:** wind energy

Dear Corp of Engineers,

I have heard that the wind energy project is slated for open discussion soon. Please record my comments that I feel that this is the right direction to go for the future. I have witness them in Denmark and to me they are the best idea we have yet to find clean energy.

Ken Sparkes  
Waterville, ME 207-873-2830

322

Adams, Karen K NAE

---

**From:** Wendell Sharp [clockmaster@mac.com]  
**Sent:** Sunday, November 21, 2004 10:10 PM  
**To:** Energy, Wind  
**Subject:** Clean energy



Pasted Graphic.tiff

I wish to add my voice to those in favor of the wind farm on Cape Cod.  
We should pioneer the clean energy project here ... not give in to  
those who run the oil industry.  
Wendell Sharp  
Yarmouthport

323

**Adams, Karen K NAE**

---

**From:** Maria McFarland [kmmcf@vineyard.net]

**Sent:** Saturday, November 20, 2004 2:46 PM

**To:** Energy, Wind

**Subject:** Cape Wind Project

Ms. Karen Adams  
Army Corps of Engineers,

I am asking you to extend the comment period from 60 days to 180 days in order to have adequate time to review the DEIS document.

Thank you.  
Kevin McFarland

11/26/2004

Adams, Karen K NAE

---

**From:** Thomas A Stone [tastone99@juno.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, November 20, 2004 9:07 AM  
**To:** Energy, Wind  
**Subject:** Cape Cod Wind Energy

Dear Army Corps,

I have downloaded the executive summary of the draft EIS and was quite pleased to see the minimal impact that the wind turbines would have on Nantucket Sound. During my travel to Nantucket last Wednesday (11/17/2004) on the fast ferry (Flying Cloud) I noticed the anemometry tower for Cape Wind and feel this would be a good location for the turbines. We are overdue for this type of project as it will begin our efforts for clean power and for independence from fossil fuels. We cannot keep saying "not in my backyard".

I applaud the effort of the Corps in producing the report.

Please count me as a strong supporter of the wind turbine project as sited in Nantucket Sound.

Thank you,

Thomas Stone  
86 Old Campus Drive  
East Falmouth, Mass.  
02536  
1-508-548-1599

---

Juno Platinum \$9.95. Juno SpeedBand \$14.95.  
Sign up for Juno Today at <http://www.juno.com!>  
Look for special offers at Best Buy stores.



325

**Adams, Karen K NAE**

---

**From:** Inge Perreault [Ladyauthor@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Saturday, November 20, 2004 12:08 AM  
**To:** Energy, Wind  
**Subject:** Re: Cape Wind - Windfarm in Nantucket Sound

Gentlemen,

After the oil spill in Buzzards Bay that had devastating effects on the South Coast, I founded the Southcoast Chapter of CLEAN POWER NOW in New Bedford, encompassing the entire South Coast. As a true grass-roots organization we have worked diligently educating and informing the public in regard to the poor environmental conditions we, on the South Coast of MA are subjected to, due to the fossil-fuel burning power plants Brayton Point and the Mirant Plant where the Bouchard barge was headed.

The traumatic experience of seeing our environment polluted for decades to come by the effects of this accident that could have been prevented, caused us to focus our negative energy and anger into a positive direction, supporting the wind farm in Nantucket Sound, as well as other sources of clean, renewable energy to divest ourselves from foreign oil and dirty coal. We, as a large group of concerned citizens, fully support the wind farm and applaud the findings of the Corps of Engineers. The arguments raised by the opposition, the "environmental" organization Alliance to Protect Nantucket Sound, has done nothing but spread misinformation about the project in the most devious and criminal manner.

It is astonishing to witness how the opponents cross party lines - the only thing they seem to have in common is wealth and power, as well as huge mansions on the Cape. When the wind farm becomes a reality, it will provide the Cape and Islands with 75% of the needed electricity and thus benefit the South Coast as well, since Brayton Point and the Mirant Power Plant will be backed off, thus less emissions will be polluting our air and water. Naturally also less oil barges will be passing through Buzzards Bay, which are by far more dangerous to the environment and wild-life than modern wind turbines

After living here for only 2 years in semi-retirement, I was advised by my physician last week, that I have contracted COPD (a form of bronchitis that will only worsen). I have never smoked in my 57 years but I was exposed to the fumes of the spilled Bunker Oil from the Bouchard accident and am daily exposed to the emissions of the surrounding power plants, even though I live on West Island off Fairhaven.

My physician, Dr. Messina, who is a pulmonary specialist, confirmed that this chronic disease has reached epidemic proportions in this area of the South Coast, causing 106 premature deaths per annum. These figures and the related health care cost are confirmed by a Harvard Study and, not counting the human suffering, I believe in my heart by far outweigh the concerns raised by the opponents of the project. What we are seeing is environmental injustice, perpetrated by people who come to summer in their mansions for a short time only, but do not wish to see a wind turbine in the far-off distance. It is the worst case of the NIMY phenomenon I have ever experienced.

Being a free-lance writer and an author, I moved to this area with my husband because we were looking forward to simplifying our lives, live in harmony with nature and the environment of the ocean, so stimulating to a creative person like myself. Now I feel like I am surrounded by toxins, my physical condition has deteriorated which proves that point. Never again will I be able to go quahauging in this area - think about that for a minute.

The wind farm will open the door for other wind farms to be build along the eastern seaboard, eliminating pollution, severing our unholy alliance in the Middle East and help us to catch up with Europe in alternative ways of creating clean renewable energy.

In the name of the members of the Southcoast Chapter of Clean Power Now, I urge the Corps of Engineers to approve the construction of the Cape Wind project. Off-shore wind farms can produce more energy and are less visible than on-land wind turbines, though we are in full

11/26/2004

support of those as well. The people of this area need your help, please do not let us down. To compare the Nantucket Sound to the Grand Canyon is a most recent phenomenon, and I am sure the powerful elite has homes elsewhere they can vacation in, to avoid looking out and see wind turbines peacefully turning on the horizon far out to sea. At what point is the health and welfare of the majority of people more important than the view of a tiny but powerful minority?

Sincerely,  
Inge Perreault (Director of Southcoast Chapter of CPN)  
51 Balsam St.  
Fairhaven, MA. 02719

Tel.: 508.997.0621  
e-mail: [ladyauthor@comcast.net](mailto:ladyauthor@comcast.net)  
[www.ingeperreault.com](http://www.ingeperreault.com)

Comment Sheet  
On Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)  
For the proposal for an Offshore Wind Project  
In Nantucket Sound

326

Name: Beverly Fearay

Address: Box 1475

EDGARTOWN, MASS 02539

Phone Number (Please include area code): \_\_\_\_\_

Email Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Please state your questions/comments in the space below:

Why when you took so long  
to write 4000 pages, you  
only give us 60 days to  
try to absorb,

GIVE US AT LEAST 120 DAYS,  
IS IT POLITICAL PRESSURE?

Please fold this questionnaire in half, affix two stickers or pieces of tape,  
and mail it to the address listed on the other side.

# KOLP Engineering

327

102 Fox Den Road  
Avon, CT 06001  
860-675-1942  
[klpengr95@aol.com](mailto:klpengr95@aol.com)

November 22, 2004

Ms. Karen K. Adams  
Army Corps of Engineers  
696 Virginia Road  
Concord, MA 01742  
Dear Ms. Adams:

Subject: Horseshoe Shoal Wind Turbines

My wife and I have a home in South Chatham about a 10-minute walk from Nantucket Sound. I have spent my entire career designing, project managing, building and commissioning gas turbine and combined cycle power plants until my retirement earlier this year. I spent my final three years building and commissioning the heat recovery steam boilers at the 1600 MW Mystic combined cycle plant in Everett, MA; the plant went into commercial operation in 2003.

Last week I attended a public forum in Harwich hosted by the League of Women Voters on the subject of wind turbines proposed for Horseshoe Shoals in Nantucket Sound. I am impressed with the capability of these turbines. Until recently wind turbines were too small and inefficient to be commercially competitive, but these 3300 KW machines located in high-velocity winds make this form of generation a viable option for future additions to the electric generating mix. Given that these machines are non air polluting and require no fuel, I am convinced they will become a staple in the U.S. electric generation industry. That said, a couple of comments on the comparisons made between the wind turbines and current power generation technology during the LOWV forum are in order.

During the forum, it was stated that the 170-MW average output of the 130 wind turbines would offset the equivalent power from a plant similar to the Cape Cod Canal Station in Sandwich, MA. Actually, I don't imagine the owners of the Canal Plant will want to shut down their units as long as they can generate power profitably (for the next 10-20 years, all things being equal). The wind turbines are likely to be competing against other forms of new generation such as the gas-fired combined cycle units at the Mystic Plant site mentioned above. As the following table indicates, 170 MW of a combined cycle plant (on about 2 acres of land) would use roughly 80% of the fuel consumed by an oil-fired thermal plant, produce no sulfur oxides (there is negligible sulfur in natural gas fuel), generate 24 Tons/year of nitrous oxides (vs. 800 Tons from the thermal plant) and release about half the CO<sub>2</sub> (500,000 vs. 1,000,000 Tons/year) of the thermal plant. These figures are quoted not to obviate the argument for wind turbines; on the contrary, as the table illustrates, the wind turbines hold up very well against combined cycle, and personally I support such a clean, renewable form of electric power generation.

## **Comparison of 170 MW Power Generating Plants**

	Oil-fired Thermal (Canal Plant)	Wind Turbines (Horseshoe Shoals)
Comb. Cycle (Mystic Plant)		

Power (KW)	170,000	170,000	170,000
Heat Rate (BTU/KWH-LHV)	6,800	8,400	
Gas Fuel Consumption (CFH)	1,284,444		
Equivalent Liquid Fuel (Gal./Year)	77,000,000		
Bunker C Fuel (Gal./Year)		95,000,000	Zero
Sulfur Oxides (Tons/Year)	Zero	2,400	Zero
NOx (Tons/Year)	24	800	Zero
CO2 Discharge (Tons/Year)	500,000	1,000,000	Zero

As one who has spent many hours during the last 35 years enjoying the panorama of Nantucket Sound with friends and family, I think that it may be short sighted for the future of wind turbines to locate such a conspicuous display of power generation in the midst of this natural wonder. The adverse impact on tourism and property values in close proximity to Horseshoe Shoal may well dwarf the economic and environmental benefits of the turbines. Even if the developer is successful in siting these first 130 turbines in Horseshoe Shoal, I suspect the hue and cry against the specter of the installed turbines will preclude wind turbine installation at the two proposed future sites in the Sound and dog the siting of other turbines throughout the U.S. Placing turbines in the Sound is tantamount to lining them up along the rim of the Grand Canyon, or the coast of Big Sur or among the islands of Acadia National Park. It is critical to the future of wind turbines to make this first major site as environmentally benign as possible.

My recommendation would be to locate this first wind farm at least 12 miles offshore, i.e. at a virtually invisible distance from land (a profile 10" long and less than ¼" above the horizon). The Horseshoe Shoal site will look like a ½" high, 20" wide thicket of turbines when viewed from the shore. While the added expense of taller (extending to greater depths), stronger towers and longer transmission lines will drive up the cost of such a location, higher wind velocities further out to sea may offset these added capital costs by increasing operating revenues. It is my understanding that the Europeans have already installed turbines over 12 miles offshore and the technological obstacles of added depth and longer cables have been successfully overcome. Finally, I suspect that if the wind farm is relocated outside such an environmentally and politically sensitive area as Horseshoe Shoal, siting approval time will be improved for the project.

Sincerely,

Donald A. Kolp, P.E.  
President

DAK:dk

E-copies: Gov. Romney, Senator Kennedy, Senator Kerry, Rep. Delahunt

328

**Adams, Karen K NAE**

---

**From:** Doug Savidge [dsavidge@verizon.net]

**Sent:** Monday, November 22, 2004 7:55 AM

**To:** Energy, Wind

**Subject:** Cape Wind Project

Good morning,

I am fully in support of the Cape Wind Project. There are so many positive aspects of the project...no pollution, no use of foreign oil, etc. etc.

One thing I would like to see is that is not a "Free ride" for Cape Wind. I believe that there should be a lease cost to the use of the off shore property for this private venture.

Thank you.

Regards,

Doug Savidge

\*\*\*\*\*

Doug Savidge  
308 West Central Street  
Franklin, MA 02038  
P: 508-528-6668  
F: 508-300-8178  
[dsavidge@verizon.net](mailto:dsavidge@verizon.net)

11/26/2004

**Adams, Karen K NAE**

---

329

**From:** arnold katz [starfe1@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, November 22, 2004 9:46 AM  
**To:** Energy, Wind  
**Subject:** Cape Wind

NEEDS THE FULL SUPPORT OF THE GOVERNMENT . THIS IS A PROJECT THAT IS GOOD FOR EVERYONE. EVEN THOSE WHO FEEL THEY WILL LOOSE SOME OF THERE PRECIOUS VIEW OF THE OCEAN. WE NEED TO START THE CHANGE AND THIS IS WHERE TO BEGIN!!!!!!

ARNOLD KATZ  
2708 WIMBLEDON CT  
CARROLLTON TX 75006

11/26/2004

**Adams, Karen K NAE**

---

330

**From:** jpye@connellypartners.com

**Sent:** Tuesday, November 23, 2004 10:59 AM

**To:** Energy, Wind

**Subject:** Please extend the public comment period on the Cape Wind DEIS



Please immediately extend the public comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Cape Wind project to 180 days. Any shorter time period is entirely insufficient to allow the public ample opportunity to provide input on such a lengthy and important document on a complex and controversial project.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Janet Pye

11/26/2004



**Adams, Karen K NAE**

---

**From:** BrooksRoba@aol.com  
**Sent:** Monday, November 22, 2004 10:28 AM  
**To:** Energy, Wind  
**Subject:** Wind farm project

331

Dear Karen Kirk-Adams,

I have been a summer resident of Oak Bluffs on Martha's Vineyard for 35 years. I support the concept of alternative energy forms like wind farms.

However I do NOT think the Nantucket Sound shoals is the place for the East Coast's first wind farm. Cape Cod and the Islands depend on their pristine beauty to support their economy by attracting tourists. Why couldn't the first wind farm be place in an more urban setting like Boston harbor?

Sincerely,  
Brooks Robards  
20 Langworthy Road  
Northampton, MA 01060  
6 Samoset Avenue  
Oak Bluffs, MA 02557

**Adams, Karen K NAE**

---

**From:** Gil Roberts [mx55dad@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, November 26, 2004 7:21 PM  
**To:** Energy, Wind; admin@saveoursound.org  
**Subject:** Comments on Cape Wind DEIS

332

Hello,

Being a local resident and rate payer I have been watching this project very closely.

I beleive the build and maintenance costs have been seriously underestimated like the BIG DIG and I as a raterpayer will be saddled with the expense.

We already pay some of the highest electricity rates in the country and this project will not help to lower them.

Renewable energy is an alternative, but ocean generators have proved to be a dismal failure.

Please extend the comment period so there will be no questions about who was not heard from about this ocean industrial site.

A local resident and year round ratepayer,  
Gilbert+Sharon Roberts  
P.O.Box 146\ 506 County Rd.  
Monument Bh. Ma. 02553

Thank you.

---

Do you Yahoo!?  
Meet the all-new My Yahoo! - Try it today!  
<http://my.yahoo.com>

**Adams, Karen K NAE**

---

**From:** John Meyer [jdm@texas.net]  
**Sent:** Friday, November 26, 2004 4:56 AM  
**To:** Energy, Wind  
**Subject:** Re: NAE-2004-338-1

My name is John Meyer and I was born in Hyannis Hospital 50 years ago. Our antique family summer house in Centerville has been in the family since 1941. I must say that I am amazed that a wind farm is being considered in Nantucket Sound.

I am very much in favor of renewable energy but at what price? The natural beauty of Nantucket Sound can not be renewed once it has been ruined by a wind farm. Has anyone thought about the economic impact on the real estate market on the south shore of Cape Cod if a wind farm is plunked down in the water within view from the beautiful shores and beaches? The Cape Cod schools are now slashing budgets and cutting programs because the tax base can not fund the schools. If a wind farm is built in Nantucket Sound what do you think will happen to the property values of the homes along the south shore? When the homes are assessed at true market value and that value has been reduced by the sight of the wind farm, the tax base will suffer and so will the schools.

There are plenty of hills inland on Cape Cod where the wind blows freely. A land based wind farm would make connection to transmission lines much easier and less costly than underwater cables. I realize that land based wind farms require "purchasing" land rather than "taking" water space but I hate the idea of the beauty of Cape Cod's south shore and precious Nantucket Sound being destroyed by a wind farm.

Renewable energy is necessary but at what price? NANTUCKET SOUND IS NOT RENEWABLE. There are land based alternatives that should be considered.

John D. Meyer  
jdm@texas.net

334

**Adams, Karen K NAE**

---

**From:** Joanne Hynes [joannehynes@yahoo.com]**Sent:** Saturday, November 27, 2004 4:25 PM**To:** Energy, Wind**Subject:** Cape Wind Report

Army Corps of Engineers,

I have just requested your **4,000 PAGE** DEIS report on your findings related to the Cape Wind report. Is this true? Is this report actually 4,000 pages long? If so, this is ludicrous! Drowning the concerned public in words is a cheap ploy to discourage us, and keep us uninformed instead of informed! This report should NOT be paid for by the Cape Wind Project!

And now you limit the time to respond to 60 days. Does this seem incredibly biased to you? And I suppose you will actually gauge your responses to this overkill report as the actual concern for the project. This is insulting and a travesty.

THE PEOPLE OF CAPE COD DO NOT WANT THIS CAPE WIND PROJECT IN OUR BACKYARD. PERIOD.

JoAnne and Toby Hynes  
324 Bridge Street  
Osterville, Ma 02655

11/29/2004

335

**Adams, Karen K NAE**

---

**From:** acksilver@comcast.net

**Sent:** Saturday, November 27, 2004 12:05 AM

**To:** Energy, Wind

**Subject:** Please extend the public comment period on the Cape Wind DEIS



Please visit the UEK site <http://uekus.com/index.html> If we need to develop renewable energy in our waters, lets try to utilize the water? Wind can be found onshore and if we explore both options we may get twice the power.

Please immediately extend the public comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Cape Wind project to 180 days. Any shorter time period is entirely insufficient to allow the public ample opportunity to provide input on such a lengthy and important document on a complex and controversial project.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Aure Hamel

11/29/2004

336

**Adams, Karen K NAE**

---

**From:** shareen@saveoursound.org

**Sent:** Saturday, November 27, 2004 8:18 AM

**To:** Energy, Wind

**Subject:** Please extend the public comment period on the Cape Wind DEIS



Please immediately extend the public comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Cape Wind project to 180 days. Any shorter time period is entirely insufficient to allow the public ample opportunity to provide input on such a lengthy and important document on a complex and controversial project.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Shareen Davis

337

**Adams, Karen K NAE**

---

**From:** Nathan Ketchel [nateketchel@msn.com]**Sent:** Saturday, November 27, 2004 8:08 AM**To:** Energy, Wind**Subject:** Cape Wind NAE-2004-338-1

To whom it may concern:

I am writing in response to the release of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the planned 130 turbine wind farm known as Cape Wind (NAE-2004-338-1). I am writing to you today in support of the project. I have taken a look at the findings in the report and have noted the great benefits that this project will bring to our region of Massachusetts. First is the creation of jobs, 600 to 1,000 people will be employed during the construction phase and 154 permanent jobs will be introduced to the region. As is well known, many areas across the country are suffering from large losses of jobs, though 154 new permanent jobs way not sound like many, but in Barnstable County the operation of the wind farm will result in annual permanent increases of \$21.8 million in economic output; \$10.2 million in value added; and, nearly \$7 million in labor income. The second major positive for this project to be completed is the energy itself. The amount of energy expected to be produced will help offset the usage of highly polluting coal and oil power plants located nearby. Most likely you are aware of the oil spill that Buzzard's Bay experiences nearly 2 years ago while oil was being transported to Mirant's Canal power plant. I live in Mattapoisett, MA which experienced heavy damage caused by that spill. If one less barge full of oil has to be transported through Buzzard's Bay then its one less bullet in the chamber in this game of Russian roulette that it played. Plus building this renewable energy source will reduce the cost of compliance with the Renewable Energy Portfolio Standards (RPS) for Massachusetts electricity consumers. Among the biggest positive attributes of this project are the health benefits. Cape Wind could have an annual cumulative beneficial effect on public health estimated at approximately \$53 million dollars resulting from reduced power plant pollution. At first I was concerned about marine vessel navigation but the DEIS has concluded that no major impact will be had on sea and air navigation. The biggest plus to the project in my mind is the reduction of greenhouse gasses, as a 23 year old I'm very concerned about this due to the expected timetable of global warming and the effects that it will have on my life 50 years down the road. As part of the DEIS findings that there will be a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions of over a million tons a year, I think again we are taking a step in the right direction. Since this project is located and will impact the cape the most, this reduction in greenhouse gasses is severely needed seeing how the cape has some of the worst air quality in the United States. My last reason for supporting this project is the fact that it will have little impact on the shores of the cape. The fog horns on the towers are expected to only be heard within a half mile of each tower, leaving ocean front residents without the annoyance of listening to them at night, though the towers will be visible on the horizon, they are not expected to dominate the landscape from shore. In my opinion that is only a small price to pay for securing the region's energy needs for the future. So in conclusion I support the construction of the 130 turbine wind farm by Cape Wind. Thank You.

Nathan C Ketchel

18 Foster St

Mattapoisett, MA 02739

508-932-2308

11/29/2004

**Adams, Karen K NAE**

---

**From:** The Pardos [stan.pardo@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Saturday, November 27, 2004 1:21 PM  
**To:** Energy, Wind  
**Subject:** Cape Wind project in Nantucket Sound

I demand an extension of the comment period on the wind power project in Nantucket Sound from 60 days to 180 days in order to have time to review this massive document—the Draft Environmental Impact Statement on the Cape Wind project. I do not see the proof of the advantages for the public. I am not at all convinced that there will be a significant savings in electricity bills and I am extremely concerned about the environmental and safety hazards. It seems that the only one winning party here is Cape Wind.

Sincerely,  
Mary Alyce Pardo  
Home owner -

Nantucket Island

11/29/2004



339

**Adams, Karen K NAE**

**From:** Shawn John [grubeci@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, November 27, 2004 12:57 AM  
**To:** Energy, Wind  
**Subject:** YES: Windpower off American Shores: Yes

Dear Ms? Karen Kirk Adams:

YES to the wind project though fewer turbines may be in order...I can't see them from here!

To choose a company that generates renewably and alternatively is a plus as for choice and electricity deregulation.

This is American leadership.  
 The rolling up of sleeves reputation of Army Corp of Engineers is again demonstrated.

Best Regards,

a more civil civilian...hot air and talk is cheap...  
 wind is CHEAPER  
 (...than Pilgrim  
 than wars,  
 than acid raid,  
 then smell of canal power, etc.)

```
<form action="https://www.paypal.com/cgi-bin/webscr" method="post">
<input type="hidden" name="cmd" value="_xclick">
<input type="hidden" name="business" value="grubeci@hotmail.com">
<input type="hidden" name="item_name" value="PUBLIC in REPUBLIC">
<input type="hidden" name="item_number" value="101">
<input type="image"
src="https://www.paypal.com/images/x-click-butcc-donate.gif" border="0"
name="submit" alt="Make payments with PayPal - it's fast, free and secure!">
</form>
```

```
<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 3.2//EN">
```

```
<HEAD>
  <META HTTP-EQUIV="Content-Type" CONTENT="text/html;CHARSET=iso-8859-1">
  <META NAME="GENERATOR" Content="Visual Page 2.0 for Windows">
  <TITLE>untitled</TITLE>
</HEAD>
```

```
<BODY>
```

```
<P><script language="javascript"
src="http://ffs.capwiz.com/DHTML/CAjsform.js"></script><form method="get"
action="http://capwiz.com/stickers/" onsubmit="return verify(this);"><input
type="hidden" name="dir" value="congressorg" /><input type="hidden"
name="lvl" value="C" /><table cellpadding
```

340

**Adams, Karen K NAE**

---

**From:** RSKates@aol.com  
**Sent:** Sunday, November 28, 2004 2:58 AM  
**To:** Energy, Wind  
**Subject:** Re: Cape Cod Potential Wind Energy

Attention Hearing Officer:

I am Richard S. Kates, and I live at 4 East Boulevard, Onset, MA 02558 [PO Box 78]. My phone is 508 295 3045, and my [best number is] 781 765 2322. Kindly enter my statement in your hearings.

I am in favor of these wind turbines.

I have seen films of the wind turbines off the coast of Denmark. I'll be the first to say they are not the most attractive looking things, en masse, but they do so much good. We have a chance to reduce somewhat the dependence on foreign oil. There is very little risk with this project, even the audoburn society [of which I belong] seem to say that they favor this concept, and that the number of birds killed is very small.

As far as a tourist detraction, this isn't the case. In fact some will actually get to the best viewing place to see these fields. [That appears to be the case in Denmark.]

As a boater, I can't understand anyone's legitimate objections. We'd just stay away from them!

Sincerely,

Richard S. Kates  
M.Ed/ MBA/PhD

11/29/2004

**Adams, Karen K NAE**

---

**From:** JAMES TOTTEN [jt135@msn.com]  
**Sent:** Sunday, November 28, 2004 1:36 PM  
**To:** Energy, Wind  
**Subject:** No! to Wind Towers in Nantucket Sound

As an individual, not attached to any organized group. I would like to request that all the time that is required to make sure that these proposed towers are what the people want, are safe for the environment, safe for the fishing industry both commercial and sportsman alike. That the land that they hopefully will Never be built on is not just given away for free But, will cost the builders many times the cost of what an acre of land costs for shore front property on the cape and islands.

If these people that want to build these towers are so concerned about the rising costs of electricity on the cape and surrounding areas, than make them put it writing that "All" of the power generated will stay here. That they will be totally responsible for any spills no matter how big or small, that they will guarantees that no wild life will die in the process.

Make these jerks put the towers where nobody can see them from land if they want them in the water....

Thank you for your time. The Cape is a very unique and should remain that way. Do not let these Moron's who only have \$\$\$\$ as the reason for this project, Overrides the wishes of the majority.

347

**Adams, Karen K NAE**

---

**From:** Nancy Whipple [whipplen@adelphia.net]

**Sent:** Sunday, November 28, 2004 3:02 PM

**To:** Energy, Wind

**Subject:** Cape Wind Project

Dear Sirs:

I would like to request that you extend the comment period from 60 days to 180 in order to adequately review the document submitted by the Army Corps of Engineers.

Thank you.

Nancy B. Whipple

POB 904

Edgartown, MA 02539

11/29/2004

343

**Adams, Karen K NAE**

---

**From:** tapapageorge@cs.com

**Sent:** Sunday, November 28, 2004 3:06 PM

**To:** Energy, Wind

**Subject:** Please extend the public comment period on the Cape Wind DEIS



Please immediately extend the public comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Cape Wind project to 180 days. Any shorter time period is entirely insufficient to allow the public ample opportunity to provide input on such a lengthy and important document on a complex and controversial project.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Themis Papageorge

11/29/2004

344

**Adams, Karen K NAE**

---

**From:** Tony Leonard [ptown\_native@yahoo.com]**Sent:** Sunday, November 28, 2004 7:50 PM**To:** Energy, Wind**Subject:** Wind farm off Nantucket Sound

To Whom It May Concern;

I am a born-and-raised resident of Cape Cod who is in full support of Cape Wind. I understand the concerns of many citizens of the Cape- that the turbines will affect tourism, and fishing, and wild life in negative ways- but I believe, as has been found in your report, that there is no plausible evidence to support these claims. Instead, I believe the folks who are against the project are using "scare tactics" in order to dissuade the public from supporting it, for reasons I am uncertain of. I only hope that enough of the public will look into it for themselves, rather than relying on the word of the so-called "Alliance to Protect Nantucket Sound." Protect it from what?

On the other hand, I understand the hesitancy of these concerned citizens- a project such as this has never been undertaken- at least in this country. Novelty tends to frighten people; however, as anybody who pays attention knows, alternative energy needs to be researched and implemented- and soon. Estimates of the amount of time until fossil fuels- particularly crude oil- are depleted vary, but it seems it will very likely be within at least our grandchildren's, if not our children's lifetimes. There is little time left for hesitancy. I would be proud to be able to say that I lived in the first community in the U.S. to adopt such a project; we need to start somewhere. Keep up the good work.

Thank you very much for your time.

Mr. Anthony Leonard  
P.O. Box 510  
Truro, MA 02666

---

Do You Yahoo!?

Tired of spam? Yahoo! Mail has the best spam protection around  
<http://mail.yahoo.com>

11/29/2004

345

**Adams, Karen K NAE**

---

**From:** juliebender [juliebender@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Sunday, November 28, 2004 4:37 PM  
**To:** Energy, Wind  
**Subject:** Proposed wind farm

I will be unable to attend the meeting in West Yarmouth on December 7, 2004. I wish to be recorded as a citizen of Yarmouth who supports alternative energy sources and at this point in time I particularly support the proposed wind farm in Nantucket Sound. This is forward looking project which will benefit Cape Cod using renewable energy sources.

Julie M. Bender  
39 Miriah Drive  
Yarmouth Port, MA 02675  
508-394-6194

11/29/2004

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

346

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

F. Lance Isham

Date 11/10/04

Print Name

F. Lance Isham

Address

P.O. Box 335

City

Weymouth Port

State MA

Zip

02647

RECEIVED

NOV 24 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

347

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

Timothy W. Furham

Date

11/22/04

Print Name

Timothy W. Furham

Address

P.O. Box 802

City

Osterville

State

MA

Zip

02655

RECEIVED

NOV 24 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION



Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

348

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, \_\_\_\_\_

Date 11/23/04

Print Name Erwin Brilliant

Address 118 Meadowbrook Rd

City Newton Ctr., Ma. State Ma.

RECEIVED  
NOV 24 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION  
Zip 02459

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

349

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Tom Roberts

Date 11/23/04

Print Name Thomas S. Roberts

Address 106 Edmunds Road

City Wellesley State MA

RECEIVED  
NOV 24 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION  
Zip 02181

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

Print Name

Address

City

State

Zip

Date

RECEIVED

NOV 24 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

350

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

Print Name

Address

City

State

Date

RECEIVED

NOV 24 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

Zip


351

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

352

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,



Date 11/19/04

Print Name Peter E Bentivegna M.D

Address 150 Ansel Hallet Rd

City W. Yarmouth

State MA

RECEIVED

NOV 24 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION


Zip 02073

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

353

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,



Date 11/22/04

Print Name Robert Birmingham

Address 2007 Oyster Harbors

City Osterville

State MA

RECEIVED

NOV 24 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

Zip 02655

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

354

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Tracy T. Isham

Date 11/21/04

Print Name Tracy T. Isham

Address 57 Graydon Ave

City Hyannis Port State MA

RECEIVED  
NOV 24 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION  
Zip 02647

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

355

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Robert Johnson

Date 11/22/04

Print Name Robert Johnson

Address 18 Louisburg Square

City Boston State MA

RECEIVED  
NOV 24 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION  
Zip 02108

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

356

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, P. SECOR

Date 11/15/04

Print Name PETER SECOR

Address 24 WHITNEY RD.

City SHIRLEY State MA

Zip 01464

RECEIVED  
NOV 24 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

357

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Jane E. Gavin

Date 11/20/04

Print Name MRS. James M. GAVIN

Address 511 Oak Haven Dr

City Altamonte Springs State FL


Zip 32701

RECEIVED  
NOV 24 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

358

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,  Date 11/22/04  
Print Name PATRICK ROBINSON  
Address 150 POINT ISABELL RD  
City COTUIT State MA Zip 02635

RECEIVED  
NOV 24 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

359

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Susan Jacobson Date 11/22/04  
Print Name Susan & Russell Jacobson  
Address 35 PARKER RD  
City OSTEAVILLE State MA. Zip 02655

RECEIVED  
NOV 24 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

THIS AREA IS A NATIONAL TREASURE & should NOT have  
WIND FARM

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

360

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Mary A. Cremius Date 11/19/04  
Print Name MARY A. CREMIUS  
Address 12 ARROWHEAD DRIVE  
City WEST DENNIS State MA Zip 02670

RECEIVED  
NOV 24 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

361

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Sandra + Tom Murphy Date 11/22/04  
Print Name SANDRA + THOMAS MURPHY  
Address 35 Cottage Dr.  
City W. Yarmouth State MA Zip 02673

RECEIVED  
NOV 24 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

362

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

*Michelle Andolini*

Date 11/21/04

Print Name

Michelle Andolini

Address

25 Martha's Lane

City

South Harwich

State

MA

Zip

02661

RECEIVED

NOV 24 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

363

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

*Arthur Massicott*

Date 11/22/04

Print Name

Arthur Massicott

Address

25 GARDINER LANE

City

OSTERVILLE

State

MA

Zip

02655

RECEIVED

NOV 24 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION



Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

364

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

*Christopher E. Page*

Date

11/14/04

Print Name

CHRISTOPHER E. PAGE

Address

144 IRVING AVE.

City

Hinghamport

State

MA.

RECEIVED  
NOV 24 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

Zip

02047

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

365

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

*Nello R. Trevisan*

Date

11/21/04

Print Name

NELLO R. TREVISAN

Address

21 SKYMEADOW DR

City

ORLEANS

State

MA

RECEIVED  
NOV 24 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

Zip

02653

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

366

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Alison D. Altm

Date 11/24/04

Print Name ALISON D. ALTM

Address 106 PATTERSON AVE

City GREENWICH

State CT

RECEIVED

NOV 24 2004

Zip

06830

REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

367

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, James W. Wolitarsky

Date 11/20/04

Print Name JAMES W. WOLITARSKY

Address 33 MEADOW VIEW DRIVE

City Nantucket, MA

State

RECEIVED

NOV 24 2004

Zip

02554

REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

368

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Wylie Collins

Date 11/16/04

Print Name Wylie Collins

Address 488 Mansfield

City Darien

State CT

RECEIVED

NOV 24 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

06820

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

369

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Alexis Gahagan

Date 11/18/04

Print Name Alexis Gahagan

Address 8 Indian Trail

City Osterville

State MA

Zip 02655

RECEIVED

NOV 24 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

370

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

*SHB*

Date 11 / 21 / 2007

Print Name

Stephen H. Perry

Address

6 Ginger Lane (Box 186)

City

Osterville

State

MA

Zip

02655

RECEIVED

NOV 24 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

371

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

*Anne I. Ehart*

Date

11 / 18 / 04

Print Name

Anne I. Ehart

Address

25 Smoke Valley Rd

City

Osterville

State

MA

Zip

02655

RECEIVED

NOV 24 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

372

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, \_\_\_\_\_

Date 11/20/04

Print Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_

State \_\_\_\_\_

Zip \_\_\_\_\_

Janice Burnes

53 Notre Dame Rd

Nedford

Ma

RECEIVED  
NOV 24 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

01730

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

373

~~378~~

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Print Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_

State \_\_\_\_\_

Zip \_\_\_\_\_

Barbara H Hess

BARBARA H HESS

PO BOX 386

OSTERVILLE

MA

02655

RECEIVED

NOV 24 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

374

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, [Signature]

Date 11/22/04

Print Name Donald J. Mackinnon

Address P.O. Box 152

City Hingham

State MA

Zip 02043

RECEIVED  
NOV 24 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

375

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, [Signature]

Date 11/23/04

Print Name Christopher J. Lee

Address 150 Truro Ln.

City Milton

State MA

Zip 02186

RECEIVED  
NOV 24 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

376

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

Jenny Collins

Date

11/20/04

Print Name

Jennifer Collins

Address

438 Mansfield

City

Dorchester

CT

State

06820

Zip

RECEIVED

NOV 24 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

377

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Johnson

Date

11/22/04

Print Name

Elizabeth Johnson

Address

18 Louisburg Square

City

Boston

State

MA

Zip

02108

RECEIVED

NOV 24 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

378

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Kelly H. Crissan

Date 11/16/04

Print Name HOLLY H CRISSAN

Address 143 Pinaloigh Path

City Osterville,

State MA

Zip 02655

RECEIVED

NOV 24 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

379

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Kathryn McDonald

Date 11/17/04

Print Name Kathryn McDonald

Address P.O. Box 293

City Centerville

State Ma

Zip 02632

RECEIVED

NOV 24 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION



Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

380

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, John B. McNamara Date 11/23/04  
Print Name John B. McNamara  
Address 109 Stonehorse Rd  
City OSTERVILLE State MA Zip

RECEIVED  
NOV 24 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

381

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Ruth A Zeller Date 11/22/04  
Print Name RUTH A ZELLER  
Address 6 CONOMIAL DRIVE  
City CHATHAM State MA Zip 02153

RECEIVED  
NOV 24 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

382

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, \_\_\_\_\_

Date 11/20/04

Print Name Richard Burnes

Address 53 Notre Dame Rd

City Bedford State Ma

Zip 01730

RECEIVED

NOV 24 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

383

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Mary A. Andolina

Date 11/22/04

Print Name Mary A. Andolina

Address PO Box 865

City Sittmanich State MA

Zip 02661

RECEIVED

NOV 24 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

384

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Estelle B. Surprenant Date 11/20/04  
Print Name ESTELLE B. SURPRENANT  
Address P.O. BOX 884  
City OAK BLUFFS State MA Zip 02557

RECEIVED  
NOV 24 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

385

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Pauline DiRocco Date 11/19/04  
Print Name PAULINE + JOE DiRocco  
Address 26 THOMPSONS TRACE  
City CHATHAM State MA Zip 02633

RECEIVED  
NOV 24 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

386

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, L. Harding

Date 11/18/04

Print Name Lori Harding

Address 50 Chardon Ln

City Osterville State Ma

Zip 02857

RECEIVED  
NOV 24 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

387

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

matmas

Sincerely, John R Buckley

Date 11/19/04

Print Name John R Buckley + Barbara

Address P.O. Box 184 - 968 Main St

City Cotuit State MA

Zip 02635

RECEIVED  
NOV 24 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

308

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Connelia D. Nicholson

Date 11/22/04

Print Name Connelia D. Nicholson

Address 44 Fairwinds Dr.

City Osterville State MA

Zip 02655

RECEIVED

NOV 24 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

309

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, William G. Nicholson

Date 11/17/04

Print Name William G. Nicholson

Address 44 Fairwinds Drive

City Osterville State MA

Zip 02655

RECEIVED

NOV 24

REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

390

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, \_\_\_\_\_

Date 11/19/04

Print Name Bruce C. Harding

Address 42 Scudder Rd

City Osterville State Ma

RECEIVED  
NOV 24 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION  
Zip 02655

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

391

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, \_\_\_\_\_

Date 11/19/04

Print Name BRUCE HARDING JR.

Address 50 CHARDON LN

City OSTERVILLE State MA

RECEIVED  
NOV 24 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION  
Zip 02655

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

392

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, \_\_\_\_\_

Date 11/19/04

Print Name Chene Harding

Address 42 Scudder Rd

City Osterville State Ma Zip 02655

RECEIVED  
NOV 24 10 40 AM  
REGULATORY DIVISION

SAW ERIN BROCKOVICH LAST NIGHT -  
COULDN'T HELP BUT THINK HOW MUCH  
TIME IT TOOK FOR HER TO UNDERSTAND  
her case - WHAT A TRAGEDY FOR  
USA IF SHE ONLY HAD 60 DAYS...  
THAT'S ALL I'VE GOT TO UNDERSTAND  
THE WIND FARM IMPACT. I REALLY  
NEED MORE TIME - I READ SLOW!

393


John Murphy  
413-427-7204

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

394

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,



Date 11/22/04

RECEIVED

Print Name

GREG DEEGAN  
117 COTUIT BAY DR  
COTUIT MA 02635

NOV 26 2004

Address

REGULATORY DIVISION

City

State


Zip

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

395

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,



Date 11/23/04

RECEIVED

Print Name

J. BARRY CRAWFORD

Address

306 WEST BAY RD

City

Osterville

State

MA

Zip

02655



Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

396

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

Richard S Taylor

Date 11/22/04

Print Name

Richard S Taylor

RECEIVED

NOV 26 2004

Address

713 Sea View Ave

REGULATORY DIVISION

City

Osterville

State

Mass

Zip

02655

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

397

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

Bryon Misch

Date 11/20/04

Print Name

Bryon Misch

RECEIVED

NOV 26 2004

Address

271 Seawatch Bend

City

East Falmouth

State

MA

Zip

02536

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

398

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, C

RECEIVED

Date 11/23/04

Print Name W. Perry

NOV 26 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

Address 21 Regatta Dr

City Malden

State MA

Zip 02649

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

399

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Rosemary M. Fuller

Date 11/23/04

Print Name

RECEIVED

Ms. Rosemary M. Fuller  
63 Beekman Dr.  
Agawam, MA 01001-2609

NOV 26 2004

Address

REGULATORY DIVISION

City

State

Zip

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

400

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Morton Fearey Date 11/12/04  
Print Name MORTON Fearey RECEIVED  
Address P.O. Box 1475 NOV 26 2004  
City Edgartown State MA Zip 02539  
REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

401

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Anne Adams Date 11/12/04  
Print Name ANNE Adams RECEIVED  
Address 759 Main St NOV 26 2004  
City Cotuit State MA Zip 02635  
REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

402

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, John B. Pennell Date 11/22/04

Print Name John B. Pennell RECEIVED

Address PO Box 961 NOV 26 2004 75 Bay Rd

City Cotuit REGULATORY DIVISION  
State MA Zip 02635

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

403

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Arthur McCarthy Date 11/15/04

Print Name ARTHUR MCCARTHY NOV 26 2004

Address P.O. Box 541 REGULATORY DIVISION

City OSTERVILLE State MA Zip 02655

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

404

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Edward Richardson RECEIVED Date 11/23/04  
Print Name Edward Richardson NOV 26 2004  
Address 5 Quail Hollow Circle REGULATORY DIVISION  
City Sandwich State MA Zip 02563

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

405

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Roy Burton RECEIVED Date 11/24/04  
Print Name Roy Burton NOV 26 2004  
Address 329 Clams Shell Cove Rd REGULATORY DIVISION  
City Cotuit State Ma Zip 02635

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

406

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, James M. Clark RECEIVED Date 11 / 22 / 04  
Print Name James M. Clark NOV 26 2004  
Address 191 Buzzance Pt. P.O. Box 42 REGULATORY DIVISION  
City Woods Hole State MA Zip 02543

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

407

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Robert B. Scales Date 11 / 23 / 04 RECEIVED  
Print Name Robert B. Scales NOV 26 2004  
Address 30 Cap'n Samadrus Rd. REGULATORY DIVISION  
City Cotuit State MA Zip 02365-1384

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

408

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

Mary S Feorey

Date 11/12/04  
RECEIVED

Print Name

Mary S Feorey

NOV 25 2004

Address

75 Planting Field Way

REGULATORY DIVISION

City

Edgartown

State

MA

Zip

02539

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

409

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

James H. Harre Jr.

Date 11/22/04

RECEIVED

Print Name

James H. Harre Jr.

NOV 26 2004

Address

100 Garrison Lane

REGULATORY DIVISION

City

Osterville,

State

MA

Zip

02655

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

410

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

Russell E. Cleary

Date

11/19/04

Print Name

RUSSELL E. CLEARY

Address

30 BUTLER AVENUE E

City

WAYNARD

State

MA

Zip

01754

RECEIVED  
NOV 26 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

411

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

John Carver

Date 11/19/04

Print Name

JOHN CARVER

Address

Box 36

City

GREEN HARBOR

State

MA

Zip

02041

RECEIVED

NOV 26 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION



Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

412

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Paul Vitale Date 11/19/04  
RECEIVED  
Print Name Paul Vitale NOV 26 2004  
Address 4 Haskell Ct REGULATORY DIVISION  
City Gloucester State MA Zip 01930

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

Please don't build  
these WINDMILLS

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Letitia S. Mumford Date Nov. 22-04  
RECEIVED  
Print Name Letitia S. Mumford NOV 26 2004  
Address PO Box 17- REGULATORY DIVISION  
City Griffin State In Zip 47616  
Summer - Hyannis Port Ma 02047

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

414

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Beverly Smith-Hance Date 11/21/04

Print Name Beverly Smith-Hance RECEIVED

Address 100 Garrison Lane NOV 26 2004

City Dsterville, State MA Zip 02655 REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

415

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, JW O'Connor Date 22/NOV/04

Print Name J W O'CONNOR RECEIVED

Address 21 HARBOUR NOV 26 2004

City HARWICH PORT State MASS Zip 02646 REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

416

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

Richard A. Garsigulo

Date 11/22/04

Print Name

Richard A. Garsigulo

Address

785 Main St

City

Cohasset

State

MASS

Zip

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

417

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

Stephen M. Ouellette

Date 11/15/04

Print Name

Stephen M. Ouellette

Address

2 Gap Head Rd.

City

Rockport

State

MA

Zip


01966

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

418

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,



RECEIVED  
Date 11/23/04

Print Name

GORDON T. SULCER

Address

Crosby Circle

City

Osterville

State

MA

Zip


02655

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

419

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,



Date 11/22/04

Print Name

BARBARA FAY

RECEIVED

Address

332 WALNUT STREET

NOV 26 2004

City

WENESLEY

State

MA

Zip

02481

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

420

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, William Adler Date 11/19/04  
RECEIVED  
Print Name William Adler - Mass. Laborer's Union  
Address 8 OTIS PLACE REGULATORY DIVISION  
City Scituate State Mass Zip 02066

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

421

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, David W. Cochran Date 11/22/04  
RECEIVED  
Print Name DAVID W. COCHRAN NOV 26 2004  
Address 215 WASHINGTON AVE, T.O. Box 578 REGULATORY DIVISION  
City OSTERVILLE State MA Zip 02655

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

422


A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

Print Name

Address

City

  
Date 11/24/04  
NOV 26 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION  
RALPH HANSEN  
44 SUNSET LANE  
OSTERVILLE MA ZIP 02655

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

423


A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

Print Name

Address

City

  
Date 11/19/04  
NOV 23 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION  
DONNA SULLIVAN PECK  
42 WHITNEY AVENUE  
WESTWOOD MA ZIP 02090

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

424

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

*Vito Giacalone*

Date 11/15/04

Print Name

Vito Giacalone

RECEIVED

NOV 26 2004

Address

4 Edgewood Rd

REGULATORY DIVISION

City

Gloucester

State

MA

Zip

01930

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

425

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

*John HAVILAND*

Date 11/18/04

Print Name

John HAVILAND

RECEIVED

NOV 26 2004

Address

BOX 543 - Beach St

REGULATORY DIVISION

City

Green Harbor

State

MA

Zip

02041

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

426

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Edward J. Barrett Date 11/19/04  
Print Name Edward J. Barrett RECEIVED  
Address P.O. 62 67 Marginal St NOV 26 2004  
City Green Harbor State Ma Zip 02041 REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

427

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Ronald S. Borsean Date 11/17/04  
Print Name Ronald S. Borsean RECEIVED  
Address 18 Standish Ave NOV 26 2004  
City Plymouth State MA Zip 02360 REGULATORY DIVISION



Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

428

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

David W. St. Clair

Date

11/21/04

Print Name

DAVID W. ST. CLAIR

Address

31 Suncliff Drive

City

Tarrytown

State

NY

Zip

10591

RECEIVED

NOV 26 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

The Nature Conservancy

429

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

William O. Matthews

Date

10/10/04

Print Name

WILLIAM O. MATTHEWS

Address

2140 OYSTER HARBORS

City

OSTERVILLE

State

MA

Zip

02655

RECEIVED

NOV 26 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

430

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

*Elaine & Noel Bouvier*

Date 11/22/04

Print Name

Elaine and Noel Bouvier, SR.

Address

66 Ripple Cove Road

NOV 26 2004

City

Hyannis

State

MA

Zip

02601

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

431

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, \_\_\_\_\_

Print Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_

State \_\_\_\_\_

Zip \_\_\_\_\_

JOHN RIBIK  
KATHLEEN RIBIK  
85 UNION AVE.  
LITTLE FERRY, N.J. 07643

Date 11/22/04

RECEIVED

NOV 26 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

432

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Thomas J. Davies Date 11/24/04  
Print Name THOMAS J. DAVIES RECEIVED  
Address 65 BUCKSKIN PATH NOV 26 2004  
City CENTERVILLE REGULATORY DIVISION  
State MA Zip 02632

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

433

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, James E. Murphy Date 11/23/04  
Print Name JAMES E. MURPHY RECEIVED  
Address 34 OSTERVILLE W. BARNSTABLE Rd NOV 26 2004  
City Osterville REGULATORY DIVISION  
State MA Zip 02635

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

434

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Gretchen Murphy Date 11/23/04  
RECEIVED  
Print Name Gretchen Murphy NOV 26 2004  
Address 34 Osterville W. Barnstable REGULATORY DIVISION  
City Osterville State MA Zip 02655

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

435

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Lewis Dunn Date 11/24/04  
RECEIVED  
Print Name Lewis Dunn NOV 26 2004  
Address 82 Indian Tr. REGULATORY DIVISION  
City Centerville State MA Zip 02632

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

436

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Anthony V. Bertocci Date 11/23/04  
Print Name Tony Bertocci RECEIVED  
Address 49 Silverlea Lane NOV 26 2004  
City West Yarmouth State MA Zip 02673 REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

437

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Miles V. Murphy Jr. Date 11/22/04  
Print Name Miles V. Murphy Jr. RECEIVED  
Address Box 698, East Dennis NOV 26 2004  
City E. Dennis State MA Zip 02641 REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

438

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, ET Tonkin Date 11/24/04  
RECEIVED  
Print Name Ellen C. Tonkin  
Address 119 Surfside Rd, PO Box 402  
City Nantucket State MA Zip 02554  
NOV 26 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

439

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Donald L. Vincent & Gail E. Vincent Date 11/23/04  
RECEIVED  
Print Name Donald L. Vincent & Gail E. Vincent  
Address 10 Yearling Lane  
City Marstons Mills State MA Zip 02648  
NOV 26 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

440

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

Stephen C. Hamel

Date 11/23/04

Print Name

Stephen C. Hamel

Address

65 Hudson St.

City

Falmouth

State

Ma.

Zip

02540

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

441

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

Carl Redfield

Date 11/18/04

Print Name

CARL REDFIELD

Address

425 DOCKSIDE DR # 704

City

NAPLES

State

FL

Zip

34110

442

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

*Damon Cummings*

Date 11/23/04

Print Name

Damon Cummings

Address

1063 Washington St.

City

Gloucester

State MA

Zip

01930

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

*Dustin Ketchum*

Date 11/23/04

Print Name

Dustin Ketchum

Address

54 Stockholm Ave

City

Rockport

State

MA

Zip

01966




444

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,



Date 11/23/04

RECEIVED

Print Name EDWARD E. SMITH

NOV 23 2004

Address 333 SUMMER ST

REGISTRATION DIVISION

City MANCHESTER


State MA Zip 01944

445

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,



Date 11/22/04

Print Name

DAN MURPHY

Address

36 LOCUST ST

City

DRACUT

State MA

Zip

01826

446

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

*Robert Contrino*

Date 11/23/04

Print Name

ROBERT CONTRINO

Address

1 TREGONY BEACH

City

Rockport

State

MA

Zip

01966

RECEIVED

NOV 26 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

*John Ketchopoulos*

Date 11/23/04

Print Name

JOHN KETCHOPOULOS

Address

7 POOL'S LAKE

City

Rockport

State

MA

Zip

01966

RECEIVED

NOV 26 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

447

448

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

Ignazio Sanfilippo

Date

11/24/09

Print Name

Ignazio Sanfilippo

Address

24 Pine St

City

Gloucester

State

MA

Zip

01930

RECEIVED

NOV 23 2009

REGULATORY DIVISION

449

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

Joseph Sanfilippo

Date

11/23/09

Print Name

Joseph Sanfilippo

Address

24 Commonwealth Ave

City

Gloucester

State

MA

Zip

01930

RECEIVED

NOV 23 2009

REGULATORY DIVISION



450

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,



Date 11/23/04

RECEIVED

Print Name Peter Marston

NOV 26 2004

Address 167 E. Main St

REGULATORY DIV

City Gloucester

State MA

Zip 01930

451

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,



Date 1/1

Print Name JOSEPH ORLANDO

RECEIVED

Address 7 BIRCH BROOK HEIGHTS

NOV 26 2004

City GLOUCESTER

State MASS

Zip 01930

REGULATORY DIV

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

~~377~~ 452

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

Laura R. Reiter  
Print Name Laura R. Reiter

Date 11/13/04

Address P.O. Box 1944

City Cotuit

NOV 26 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION  
State MA

Zip 02635

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

453

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

Print Name

Jeffrey L. Hayes

Address

P.O. Box 308  
393 Lower Road

City

Brewster

State

MA

Zip

02631

Date

Nov 24 04

RECEIVED

NOV 29 2004


REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

454

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,



Print Name

John R. Hauer

Address

P.O. Box 218

City

Oskerville

State MA

Zip

02655

Date

11/28/04

RECEIVED

NOV 29 2004


REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

455

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,



Print Name

CAROL ANN SCHAEFER

Address

28 WINDMUSH LANE

City

OSTERVILLE

State

MA

Zip

02116

Date

11/29/04

RECEIVED

NOV 29 2004


REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

456

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,



Date

11/23/04

Print Name

James B. Jones

Address

265 Seaview Ave

City

Osterville

State

MA

Zip

02655

RECEIVED  
NOV 29 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

457

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,



Date

11/23/04

Print Name

James Eldredge  
21 Pleasant Pines Ave.  
Centerville, MA 02632

Address



City

State

Zip

NOV 29 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

458

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

*Frederick J. Curran*

Date

11/27/04

Print Name

FREDERICK J. CURRAN

Address

110 East Bay Rd.

City

Osterville

State

MA

Zip

02655

RECEIVED

NOV 29 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION



Audubon

Ms. Adams:

Please require the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to take steps to minimize any harm to birds in the "Cape Wind" project. Thank you

M. A. Snodgrass

Our national symbol, the Bald eagle  
Protected by the Endangered Species Act, the majestic  
Bald eagle has made a spectacular comeback from the



Ms. Mary Snodgrass  
13450 S Rivercrest Dr  
Plainfield, IL 60544-8979



GREENWICH  
MASS  
Far Far Away



459

Ms. Karen Adams  
U. S. Army Corps of  
Engineers,



New England  
District  
696 Virginia Rd.

Concord, Mass. 01742-2151

© 2003 National Audubon Society  
Printed in the USA on Recycled Paper



Dear Army Corps of Engineers:



A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

460

Sincerely,

*[Signature]*

Date

11/19/04

Print Name

RICHARD H. RHOADS

Address

PO BOX 238

City

WEST FALMOUTH

State

MA

RECEIVED  
NOV 29 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

Zip

02574

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

461

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

*[Signature]*

Date

11/20/04

Print Name

DANA S. HORNIG

Address

65 Thatcher Highway

City

Marstons Mills

State

MA

Zip

02648

RECEIVED  
NOV 29 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

462

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

R G Abrams

Date

11/23/04

Print Name

ROBERT G ABRAMS

Address

176 Tower Hill Rd

City

Osteerville

State

MA

Zip

02655

RECEIVED  
NOV 29 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

463

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

Edward W. Baceley

Date

11/24/04

Print Name

EDWARD W. BACELEY

Address

P.O. Box 2345

City

BREWSTER

State

MA

Zip

02631

RECEIVED  
NOV 29 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

464

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

*[Signature]*

Date

11/21/04

Print Name

Joan B. Hill

Address

9 Island Ave

City

Hyannis Port

State

MA

Zip

02647

RECEIVED

NOV 29 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

465

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

*[Signature]*

Date

11/20/04

Print Name

DAVID B. Hill

Address

9 Island Avenue

City

Hyannis Port

State

MA

Zip

02647

RECEIVED

NOV 29 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

466

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

*Kenneth Webb*

Print Name

*Kenneth Webb*

Address

*60 Rivers End Rd*

City

*E. Falmouth*

State

*MA*

Zip

*02536*

Date

*11/24/04*

RECEIVED

NOV 29 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

467

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

*Thomas Walko*

Print Name

*THOMAS WALKO*

Address

*22 Crosby Circle*

City

*Osterville*

State

*MA*

Zip

*02655*

Date

*11/25/04*

RECEIVED

NOV 29 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

468

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, McCallahan, AT Date 25 NOV 04  
Print Name A. S. CALLAHAN AT  
Address 3428 WOODMONT BLVD  
City NAHVILLE State TN Zip 37215

RECEIVED

NOV 29 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

469

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Arthur Pappas Date 11/24/04  
Print Name ARTHUR PAPPAS  
Address 1412 MAIN ST  
City COTUIT State MA Zip 02635

RECEIVED


NOV 29 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

470

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, 

RECEIVED  
NOV 29 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION  
Date 11/24/04

Print Name Robert GIGUE


Address 83 Town Farm Rd

City Westminster State MA Zip 01473

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

471

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, 

RECEIVED  
NOV 29 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION  
Date 11/27/04

Print Name PETER WALKUS

Address 28 PLOSNES DRIVE

City Dennisport State MA Zip 02639

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

472

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,



Date

11/26/04

Print Name

Kristin Parker

Address

90 Bursley Path

City

Woburn, MA

State

MA

Zip

02098

RECEIVED

NOV 29 2004


REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

473

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,



Date

11/24/04

Print Name

Robert Bazydlo

Address

37 Lances Ln.

City

Mansions Mills

State

MA

Zip

02648

RECEIVED

NOV 29 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

474

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Richard G. Kelley Date 11/24/04  
Print Name Richard G. Kelley  
Address 39 Carver Road  
City West Yarmouth State Mass Zip 02673

RECEIVED  
NOV 29 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

475

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, L. G. Singmaster Date 11/29/04  
Print Name L. G. SINGMASTER  
Address P.O. Box 305  
City HYANNIS PORT State MA Zip 02647

RECEIVED  
NOV 29 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION



Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

476

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Mr & Mrs Peter VanderWalk

Date 11/20/04

Print Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address 391 Seaview Ave

City Osterville

State Ma

Zip 02655

RECEIVED  
NOV 29 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

477

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Jo Anne Hynes

Date 11/27/04

Print Name JOANNE HYNES

Address 335 SUGARBERRY CIRCLE

City HOUSTON

State TX

Zip 77024

RECEIVED  
NOV 29 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

478

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Pete A. Fair

Print Name PETE A. FAIR.

Address 165 SEAPUIT RIVER ROAD.

City Osterville, State MA Zip 02655

RECEIVED  
Date 11/20/04  
NOV 20 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

479

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Glenn C. Kelley

Print Name GLENN C. KELLEY

Address P.O. Box 575

City OSTERVILLE State MA Zip 02655

RECEIVED  
Date 11/24/04  
NOV 29 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

FOLKS:

480

PLEASE FORCE "CAPE WIND"  
TO FOLLOW U.S.F.W.'S BIRD-RESEARCH  
PROTOCOL AND TAKE STEPS TO  
MINIMIZE HARM TO BIRDS, BATS,  
AND MARINE MAMMALS  
Yea, they sound like  
they're "blowing in the wind."

ROD

RECEIVED

NOV 29 2001

REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

481

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

*James P. Shay*

Date

11/24/04

Print Name

James P. Shay

Address

44 Dale Avenue

City

Hyannis Port

State

MA

Zip

02647

RECEIVED

NOV 29 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

482

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

*Alan Coroll*

Date

12/1/04

Print Name

*Alan Coroll*

Address

37, Summer St

City

*Weymouth*

State

*MA*

Zip

02493

RECEIVED

NOV 29 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

483

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

*Susan Crocker*

Date

11/15/04

Print Name

*SUSAN CROCKER*

Address

77 Pirates Cove

City

*Osterville*

State

*Ma*

Zip

02655

RECEIVED

NOV 29 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Alice H. Scudder  
ALICE H. SCUDDER  
Print Name SCOTT M. SCUDDER

Date 11/23/04

Address P.O. Box 333

City COTUIT State MA

Zip 02635

RECEIVED  
NOV 29 2004  
REGULATORY DIV.

11-24-04

Please require that "Cape Wind" follow the USFWS's bird-research protocol and take steps to minimize harm to birds, bats and marine animals.  
This is very important for a humane nation to do

485



Ms. Dixie Keyser  
10819 Sandpiper Ln.  
Dallas, TX 75230

RECEIVED  
NOV 23 2004  
REGULATORY DIV.

Dear Ms Adams:

11-25-04

I am writing to ask that the  
US Army Corps of Engineers **486**  
follow the USFWS's bird-research  
protocol and take steps to  
minimize harm to birds, bats and  
marine mammals in the  
"Cape Wind" project.

Sincerely,

Barbara Bonsignore

© Cécile van der Heiden 1992 / Zonder titel, 19.5 x 26 cm, acryl & plastic verf op goudkarton /  
Reproduction prohibited



Sandra Wachholz  
35 Hammond St #1  
Portland, ME 04101

*Sandra Wachholz*



MITTELDAMSTERDAM  
J00 BT AMSTERDAM TEL: 020-685011

RECEIVED



**487**

84711865126638

C 4537  
Printed in Holland

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

488

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, William H. Cortis

Date 11/25/04

Print Name William H. Cortis

Address 1001 Central Avenue

City Needham State MA

Zip 02492

RECEIVED

NOV 30 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

489

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Toby Hynes

Date 11/27/04

Print Name TOBY HYNES

Address 335 SUGARBERRY CIRCLE

City HOUSTON State TX

Zip 77024

RECEIVED

NOV 30 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

490

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Caroline B. Pennell Date 11/22/04  
Print Name Caroline B. Pennell  
Address P.O. Box 961 75 Bay Rd  
City Cotuit State MA Zip 02635

02635+0961 |||||

RECEIVED  
NOV 30 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

491

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Robert Broder Date 11/22/04  
Print Name ROBERT BRODER  
Address 2 MIDDLESEX ST  
City WELLESLEY State MA Zip 02482


RECEIVED  
NOV 30 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION



Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,



Print Name

Rick Stinets

Address

14 South St.

City

Osterville

State

Ma

Zip

02655

RECEIVED

NOV 30 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION


Date 11/29/04

492

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,



Print Name

Anthony A. Franchi

Address

2 Woodbridge Rd.

City

Worton

State

Ma

Zip

02493

RECEIVED

NOV 30 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION


Date 11/27/04

493

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

494

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, 

Date 11/28/04

Print Name William F. Hines

Address 135 LINDBERGH AVE

City Needham State MA


Zip 02494

RECEIVED  
NOV 30 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

495

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, 

Date 11/28/04

Print Name George D. Jones

Address 253 Seaview Ave

City Osterville State MA

Zip 02655

RECEIVED  
NOV 30 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

Time / EXT 496

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, *Carter Tallman*

Date 11/28/04

Print Name CARTER TALLMAN

Address 17 FARRWOOD DR

City ANDOVER State MA Zip 01810

RECEIVED

NOV 30 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

30 November 2004

585

Dear Ms. Adams:

We are writing to encourage the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to require that "Cape Wind" follow the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's bird research protocol and take necessary steps to minimize harm to birds, bats and marine mammals.

We are very much supportive of alternative forms of energy but we do not want these alternatives to be instituted without proper research into any and all detrimental effects. When problems start to arise, we need to stop and address them before going further. Thousands of birds and bats have already been killed by wind turbines. The recommendation of the USFWS that the developer conduct three years of comprehensive studies to determine if the location is suitable is a reasonable recommendation and we hope you will support these studies. We are avid bird watchers and do not want to see the future of our birds, bats and marine life endangered by a hasty decision. We are entering a new industry and we need to take time to study the negative effects and address them now before any more damage is done.

Again, we encourage the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to require that "Cape Wind" adhere to the USFWS's bird research protocol and take all necessary steps to minimize harm to birds, bats and marine mammals. Thank you for your time and consideration. Sincerely,


*The J. W. Davis Family*

586

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,



Print Name

Kathryn Souza

Address

62 Marie Ann Terr

City

Centerville

State

MA

Zip

02692

Date

11/29/04

RECEIVED

DEC - 3 2004


REGULATORY DIVISION

587

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,



Print Name

Alicia M. Finnerty

Address

56 Bayberry Way

City

Osterville

State

MA

Zip

02655

Date

12/30/04

RECEIVED

DEC - 3 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

588 A Three mile Wind Factory in the middle of a  
Dear Army Corps of Engineers: World Recognized Sanctuary? Do Not!  
Believe this will CRUSH the economy & science of Cape Cod!  
A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive  
4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document.  
I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order  
for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful  
and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

THE #1 MOST EXPENSIVE YOU HAVE NO IDBA WHAT A NEGATIVE  
SHAGGY SONG!! HAD TO RE-ARRANGE PROJECT YOU ARE SUPPLYING!!  
Sincerely, John D. Osmond Date 11/10/04

Print Name

John D. Osmond (Formerly from Cleveland OH)  
I watched Industry Destroy  
the North Coast!!

Address 2111 OYSTER HARBOUR

City OSTERVILLE

State MA

Zip 02655

Fish, Turtles, Fowl; ? One thousand Blinking lights, Ho Stone,  
Fish - Near-off shore - Bonkers = Lots Visit This Nowhere!!

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

589  
A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive  
4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document.  
I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order  
for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful  
and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, P. Bonifacio

Print Name

P. Bonifacio

Address

Box 557

City

E. SANDWICH

State MA

Zip 02537

WHY NOT DAM THE GRAND CANYON FOR ELECTRIC POWER.  
IT'S JUST AS ILLOGICAL TO DESTROY BEAUTIFUL NANTUCKET SOUND.  
DRILL FOR OIL IN ALASKA!!!

Date 23/11/04

RECEIVED

DEC - 3 2004

REGULATORY DIV.

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

590

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Nate Rudman Date 11/27/04  
Print Name NATE RUDMAN  
Address 178 CHIT-SAMADRAUS RD  
City COQUIT State MA Zip 02635

RECEIVED  
DEC - 3 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

591

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Robert E. Manning Jr Date 11/19/04  
Print Name Robert E. Manning  
Address 47 Stone Horse Rd  
City Osterville State MA Zip 02655

RECEIVED  
DEC - 3 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

592

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

RECEIVED  
DEC - 3 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

Sincerely,

*Paul B. Dickey, Jr.*

Date 11/29/04

Print Name Lt Paul B. Dickey, Jr. U.S.N.R. Retired

Address 20 Pine Ridge Rd

City GREENWICH State CT. Zip 06830

*I have cruised Nantucket Sound for many years under sail. This will be a total obstruction to navigation under sail.*

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

593

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

*Carl M. Mueller*  
Carl M. Mueller

Date 11/30/04

Print Name Carl M

Address 3 North Mill St.

City Nantucket State MA Zip 02854

RECEIVED  
DEC - 3 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

594

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Sarah Manning Date 11/19/04  
Print Name SARAH MANNING  
Address 47 Stonehorse Rd  
City Osterville State MA Zip 02655

RECEIVED  
DEC - 3 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

595

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Edwin N. Hodge Date 11/30/04  
Print Name EDWIN N. HODGE  
Address 111 OXFORD RD  
City KENILWORTH State IL Zip 60043

RECEIVED  
DEC - 3 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION



Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

596

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Joan Crowley

Print Name JOAN CROWLEY

Address 15 OLD WESTON RD

City WAYLAND State MA Zip 01778

Date 11/19/04

RECEIVED

DEC - 3

REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

597

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project. **PLEASE USE THE SOUND ALL THE TIME. PLEASE SAVE THE SOUND.**

Sincerely, David J. Herlihy

Print Name DAVID J. HERLIHY

Address 240 TANGLEWOOD DRIVE

City OSTERVILLE State MA Zip 02655

Date 11/30/04

RECEIVED

DEC - 3 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

598

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Courtenay A. Cryer.

Date 12/2/04

Print Name COURTENAY CRYER

Address 16 HENCHMAN 3R

City BOSTON State MA

Zip 02213  
RECEIVED  
DEC - 3 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

599

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Michael O'Connell

Date 12/2/04

Print Name MICHAEL O'CONNELL

Address 26 MEDWAY ST

City NORFOLK State MA

Zip 02056  
RECEIVED  
DEC - 3 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

600

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Kathleen C. Kelliher Date 11/24/04  
 Print Name KATHLEEN KELLIHER  
 Address P.O. Box 41, 54 SOMERSET RD.  
 City NANTUCKET State MA Zip 02554

RECEIVED  
 DEC - 3 2004  
 REGULATORY DIVISION

601

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Francis L. McKone Date 11/28/04  
 Print Name Francis L. McKone  
 Address 228 Cotuit Bay Dr.  
 City Cotuit State MA Zip 02635

RECEIVED  
 DEC - 3 2004  
 REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

602

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, JEFF + GAY HELO

Date 11/28/04

Print Name JES

Address 29 PROSPECT ST.

City KENTUCKET State MA. Zip 02554

RECEIVED  
DEC - 3 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

543

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,



Date 11/30/04

Print Name ROBERT C LEWIS

Address 215 LEWIS POND RD

City Cotuit

State MA

Zip 02635

RECEIVED

DEC - 2 2004


REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

544

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,



Date 11/27/04

Print Name William W. Greer

Address 275 Ocean St

City Hyannis

State Ma

Zip 02601

RECEIVED

DEC - 2 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

545

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

F. Munn

Date 12/29/04

Print Name

Frank Munn

Address

31 High St

City

Cotuit

State MA

Zip

02635

RECEIVED  
DEC - 2 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

546

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

Sally R. Edmonds

Date 11/28/04

Print Name

Sally R. Edmonds

Address

48 Fayerweather Street  
Cambridge, MA 02138

City

State

Zip

RECEIVED  
DEC - 2 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

547

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

*Christian Nealon*Date 11/24/04

Print Name

Christian Nealon

Address

20 Indian Head Rd

City

Framingham

State

MA

Zip

01701

RECEIVED  
DEC - 2 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

548

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

*ERHAM TURNER*

Date

11/27/04

Print Name

Address

64 DAVIDS WAY

City

BEDFORD HILLS

State

NY

Zip

10507


RECEIVED  
DEC - 2 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

549

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,



Print Name

ANTHONY SALERNO

Address

1160 MAIN ST

City

COTUIT

State

MA

Zip

02635

RECEIVED  
DEC - 2

Date 11/30/04


REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

550

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,



Print Name

JAMES J. HAYES

Address

P.O. Box 562

City

Danvers

State

MA

Zip

01923

RECEIVED  
DEC - 2

Date 11/23/04

REGULATORY DIVISION




Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

551

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,



Print Name Doug Scholm, Jr.

Address P.O. Box 432

City Siasconset

State MA

Zip 02564

Date 12/23/04

RECEIVED

DEC - 2


REGULATORY DIVISION

552

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,



Print Name JOHN A. GALLAGHER

Address 27 TASHAMA LANE

City NANTUCKET

State MA

Zip 02554

Date 12/22/04

RECEIVED

DEC - 2


REGULATORY DIVISION

553

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,



Print Name

SHEILA A. LUCEY

Address

20 VESPER LN UNIT A1

City

NANTUCKET

State

MA

Zip

02554

Date

12/24/04

RECEIVED

DEC - 2


REGULATORY DIVISION

554

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,



Print Name

Gregory J Dempsey

Address

77 HUNNEWELL AVE

City

BRIGHTON

State

MA

Zip

02135

Date

11/24/04

RECEIVED

DEC - 2


REGULATORY DIVISION

555

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, \_\_\_\_\_



Date

11/29/04

Print Name

MR. &amp; MRS. JOHN S. WELSH

Address

38 BAY STREET  
OSTERVILLE, MA 02655

City

State

Zip

RECEIVED

DEC - 2


REGULATORY DIVISION

556

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, \_\_\_\_\_



Date

11/29/04

Print Name

Coleman P. Burke

Address

37 Gardner Road

City

Nantucket

State

Ma

Zip

02554

RECEIVED

DEC - 2

REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

557

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

*Susan Payson Burke*

Print Name

SUSAN PAYSON BURKE

Address

37 GARDNER RD

City

NANTUCKET

State

MA

Zip

02554

RECEIVED  
DEC - 2 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

Date 11/29/04

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

558

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

*Ned Macomb*

Print Name

Edward (Ned) Macomb

Address

36 Wildwood Ave.

City

Madison

State

CT.

Zip

06443

RECEIVED  
DEC - 2 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

Date 11/29/04

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

559

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Chris Bean

RECEIVED  
DEC - 2 2004  
Date 11/29/04  
REGULATORY DIVISION

Print Name Christopher Bean

Address Box 158 201 Robbins Street

City Osterville State MA Zip 02655-0158

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

560

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Barbara Folger

RECEIVED  
DEC - 2 2004  
Date 11/29/04  
REGULATORY DIVISION

Print Name BARBARA FOLGER

Address 25 RAMBLER ROAD

City OSTERVILLE State MA Zip 02655

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

561

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

Print Name

Address

City

State

Zip

Date

RECEIVED

DEC - 2

REGULATORY DIVISION

Richard Louten Jr

45 Spruce St

Nantucket

MA

02554

12/1/04

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

562

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

Print Name

Address

City

State

Zip

Date

RECEIVED

DEC - 2

REGULATORY DIVISION

Christie McBarney

Christie McBarney

39 Melissa Lane

Cotuit

MA

02635

11/20/04

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

563

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Bonnie Brooks

Date 11/29/04

Print Name Bonnie Brooks

Address 59 Hummock Pond Rd.

City Nantucket

State MA

Zip 02554

RECEIVED  
DEC - 2 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

564

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Amy Longley

Date 11/29/04

Print Name Amy Longley

Address PO Box 1378

City Nantucket MA

State MA

Zip 02554

RECEIVED  
DEC - 2 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

565

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

Jane E. Bonini

Print Name

JANE Bonini

Address 3 Alexandria Dr

City

Nantucket

State

Ma

Zip

02554

RECEIVED

Date

DEC - 2 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

566

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

Sharon L. Lamb

Print Name

SHARON L. LAMB

Address

1 Henderson's Dr

City

NANTUCKET

State

MA

Zip

02554

RECEIVED

Date

DEC - 2 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION



Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

567

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

Print Name

Address

City

State

Zip

*Sandra J. Lawton*  
SANDRA J. LAWTON  
4 Spruce Street  
Dartmouth MA 01554

RECEIVED  
Date

DEC 12 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

11/18/04

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

568

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

Print Name

Address

City

State

Zip

*Dr. J. William Burns*  
Dr. J. William Burns  
90 Otis St.  
Hingham, MA MA 02043

RECEIVED  
Date

DEC 12 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

11/18/04

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

569

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

*Errol M. Thompson*

Print Name ERROL M. THOMPSON

Address 134 MILNE RD.

City OSTERVILLE

State MA

Zip 02655

RECEIVED

Date

DEC 11 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

Scott Taylor  
552 North Avenue  
Weston, Massachusetts 02193

570

RECEIVED  
DEC - 2 - 1991  
FBI/DOJ

Dear Sirs & Madames:

It is inconceivable to me that  
you can extend a 60 day time  
period to review a 4000 page doc.

Please extend the review period  
to at least 180 days.

Sincerely,  
Scott Taylor

1571  
Army Corps of Engineers,

November 29, 2004

9 ACADIA ROAD


WOODLIFF LAKE, NJ 07677

The environment is of deep concern today, as much has already been done which adversely affects it.

Please take the time now to avoid another needless insult to our natural resources. The beauty and well-planned interaction of nature is reflected in Nantucket Sound and its pristine preservation is vital! Please do not approve the Cape Wind project. There is enough destruction in the world at human hands. This is an opportunity to see that what God has created remains beautiful for generations to come to enjoy. (I summer in Popponesset.)

Take time now to avoid a great mistake. Say "No" to the Cape Wind project.

Sincerely,



PATRICIA A. FOLEY

572  
336, Sterba Lane  
Prescott AZ 86305  
Nov 27 04.

Dear Ms Adams,

I am very much in  
favor of the use of alternate  
energies but we must also take  
wildlife into consideration.

Now birds  
that fly through Nantuxet Sound  
could die by the thousands in the  
offshore "Cape Wind" facility. The U.S.  
Fish and Wildlife Service has recommended  
to the developer three years of comprehensive  
studies to determine if the location  
is suitable. These recommendations have  
been ignored.

Please take action on this  
and require that "Cape Wind" follow  
the USFWS protocol. Marine mammals,  
birds + bats must be protected. We cannot  
allow such slaughter.

Sincerely

PATRICIA JORALEMON.

Pat Joralemon

573



THE HUMANE SOCIETY OF THE UNITED STATES

Ms. Mary Ann Tartella  
3600 Sheaff Ln Apt 422  
Philadelphia PA 19145-5914

To: Karen Adams

Please require that "Cope  
Mind" follow the USFWS's  
bird-research protocol  
and take steps to  
minimize harm to birds,  
hats, and marine mammals.

Thank you,  
Mary Ann Tartella

RECEIVED  
DEC - 2 1991

ALPHABETICALLY



Mary Ann Tartella  
3600 Sheaff Ln Apt 422  
Philadelphia PA 19145

574  
December 1, 2004

The Army Corps of Engineers

Karen Adams.  
Re: Cape Wind Project

Please allow more time  
for review. I request  
that you give more time  
for review for this huge  
project which so many people  
object.

Mayorie Holbrook  
62 Temple Road  
Wellesley, MA 02482

RECEIVED  
DEC -2 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

**Alexis Burns**  
87 Chuckles Way  
Marstons Mills, MA 02648

November 24, 2004

I would like to register my objection to the Army Corps of Engineers' review of Cape Wind Associate, LLC's, proposal to industrialize 24 square miles of Nantucket Sound.

The massive project Cape Wind proposes is the first offshore wind energy project this country has faced. Currently, there are no federal laws that authorize the occupation of outer continental shelf lands by private developers or that regulate how and where such development is appropriate.

The federal government must first establish guidelines for the review of proposals such as Cape Wind's before any more development takes place. We must develop sensible standards that enable the appropriate federal agency to weigh the benefits of a proposed project against its costs, which potentially include harmful environmental impacts, negative effects on the affected region's economy and degradation of an area's aesthetic values,

These public resources belong to all of us, and it is imperative that sensible laws be passed before any projects are approved. Wealthy private developers should not determine how or where the outer continental shelf will be developed. Without an established process by which the Army Corps of Engineers, or any other federal agency, can objectively and competently review these proposals, any consideration of Cape Wind's proposed wind plant should cease.

Thank you for your consideration of this issue.

Sincerely,



Alexis Burns

RECEIVED

DEC - 7 2004

NOV 24 2004





## STIGMATINE FATHERS AND BROTHERS

Office of the Provincial

554 LEXINGTON STREET

WALTHAM, MASSACHUSETTS 02452-3097

Tel: (781) 209-3100 Fax: (781) 894-9785

Very Rev. Gregory J. Hoppough, C.S.S., S.T.D.  
Provincial Superior

Army Corps Of Engineers  
696 Virginia Rd.  
Concord, MA 01742  
Attn: Karen K. Adams

Re: Wind Farm Project – Nantucket Sound

Dear Ms. Adams:

I am writing on behalf of the Trustees of the Stigmatine Fathers, Inc., a Massachusetts religious non-profit corporation (the "Stigmatine Fathers") to voice our opposition to the proposed wind farm being discussed for Nantucket Sound.

We have read and are informed about the stated benefits of the proposed wind farm project, including those contained in your recent Draft Environmental Impact Statement. However, we oppose the proposed wind power plant in Nantucket Sound due to likely adverse economic and environmental impacts, as well as the lack of an appropriate review and permitting process.

The Stigmatine Fathers own a residence in Yarmouthport, Massachusetts that we utilize year-round. Our home serves as a vacation home for our retired priests and as a spiritual retreat for the priests of our Order. We have maintained our property for this use precisely because of the natural and serene beauty of the area, particularly our view of Nantucket Sound. The proposed wind plant is to consist of 130 wind turbines, each 417 feet tall. Each turbine will have four flashing lights, for a total of 520 flashing red and amber lights, and the corners of the complex will be marked with fog horns. This will cause visual, noise and light pollution to an area that today stands as one of the world's most beautiful and pristine seascapes.

The proposed power plant represents a taking of 24 square miles of pristine public lands by a private for-profit venture, with no discussion or permission from the state and federal agencies that are supposed to serve as the guardians of our public lands. Governor Romney has said the wind farm should not be built on a "national treasure" like Nantucket Sound. The waters off the coast of Cape Cod should not be given over to private industry without weighing the costs to the public. Nantucket Sound belongs to the people who live there and work there and vacation and play there.


RECEIVED  
DEC - 8 2009  
OFFICE OF THE PROVINCIAL

The project will likely cause significant economic losses to the local economy in business, taxes, and property values for Cape Cod, Nantucket and Martha's Vineyard. The project will negatively impact the influx of tourists who come to this area to seek out the natural beauty of the area. The proposed wind plant will pose a safety hazard to the thousands of recreational boaters and commercial fishermen that use Nantucket Sound for leisure or their livelihood. The eyesore of 130 spinning turbines will become the most recognized symbol of Cape Cod for generations to come.

Nantucket Sound is also a valuable ecological resource area that is the home to many varieties of birds, fish and other marine life. A wind plant in the midst of this sensitive ecosystem could degrade or destroy vital habitat for these creatures.

I hope due consideration will be given to the points raised by this letter. I also wish to request that the Army Corps of Engineers immediately extend the public comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Cape Wind project to 180 days. Any shorter time period is insufficient to allow the public ample opportunity to provide its input on such an important document that relates to such a significant and controversial project.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Gregory J. Hoppough". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Gregory Hoppough, C.S.S.

Provincial Superior

Trustees of the Stigmatine Fathers, Inc.

PIROLI AND PIROLI  
Attorneys at Law

**Linda T. Pirolli**  
Certified Mediator

**Michael A. Pirolli**

109 W. Broad Street  
Bridgeton, New Jersey 08302  
Telephone: (856) 453-1962

17 South High Street  
Millville, New Jersey 08332  
Telephone: (856) 825-7200

November 24, 2004

Please reply to: ☐ Bridgeton  
☒ Millville

Ms. Karen Adams  
United States Army Core of Engineers  
New England District  
696 Virginia Road  
Concord, MA 01724-2751

Re: Cape Wind


Dear Officer Adams:

This letter is to request that the Corps of Engineers require that the "Cape Wind" project follow the United State Fish and Wildlife Services Bird-Research protocol and take steps in the development of the project to minimize harm to birds, bats and marine mammals.

This project is a wonderful idea and the US Army Corps of Engineers has a magnificent opportunity to set standards for efficient and humane project management that the rest of the world can follow. Please take steps to assure that you meet the challenge.

Thank you for your consideration of this letter.

Very truly yours,



LINDA T. PIROLI

LTP/cr

RECEIVED

DEC -2 2004

REGISTRATION

578

Charles R. Lowell  
323 Garfield Road  
Concord, Mass. 01742  
978-369-1157

Ms. Karen Adams  
Army Corps of Engineers  
696 Virginia Road  
Concord, Ma. 01742

11/30/04

Dear Ms. Adams:

I am opposed to the proposed Cape Wind Project in Nantucket Sound. Although I support wind generation as a concept, I find it difficult to believe that Horseshoe Shoal is the best and only location that meets the requirements for wind generation.

I agree with arguments in a piece by Katharine Q. Seelye that appeared in The New York Times, June 5 2003 Windmills Sow Dissent for Environmentalists. Robert F. Kennedy is quoted as follows:

"There are appropriate places for everything," he said in a telephone interview. "You would not want a wind farm in Yosemite, and you wouldn't want one in Central Park." Mr. Kennedy added: "I love wind energy, but let's develop some rules about how you divide up the commons. You're essentially giving the commons over to a profit-making enterprise."

I am also concerned that the project doesn't make financial sense without government subsidies. Quoting from the same article:

"The main subsidy is the federal tax credit, which is set to expire at the end of the year but is likely to be renewed by Congress. The credit allows windmill companies to deduct 1.8 cents from their tax liability for every kilowatt hour they produce for 10 years. The savings are huge."

I think other sites should be explored, and I would think a site like Otis Airforce Base on the Cape would make much more sense both environmentally and economically.

Sincerely,



Charles Lowell

RECEIVED

DEC -2 11:11

REGISTRATION

November 30, 2004  
 JOHN J. HOUSMAN, JR.  
 148 MAPLEWOOD RD.  
 SOUTHLINGTON, CT 06489

Ms. Karen Adams  
 Project Manager  
 Regulatory Division  
 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
 696 Virginia Road  
 Concord, MA 01742

Re: Extension of Comment Period from 60 to  
 180 Days, Draft EIS on the Cape Wind  
 Project

Dear Ms. Adams:

I am a private citizen who owns property near the ocean in Mashpee, MA. It is virtually impossible for me or anyone (private citizen with no army of consultants) to review and comment on this document (some 4,000 pages) within the 60 day time frame.

If in fact you truly want the public to have an opportunity to review and participate in the EIS process, we must have time to review the draft EIS document.

Don't leave us out of the process, please extend the review period to 180 days.

Thank you for consideration.

Sincerely, *John J. Housman, Jr.*  
 JOHN J. HOUSMAN, JR.

RECEIVED  
 DEC -2 2004  
 REGULATORY DIVISION

*Carol Frith  
2763 Coleman Way  
Sacramento, CA 95818-4430  
carol4mail@aol.com*


Karen Adams  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
New England District  
696 Virginia Road  
Concord, MA 01742-2751

Dear Karen Adams,

I am writing to encourage you to require that "Cape Wind" follow the USFWS's bird-research protocol and do whatever is necessary to minimize harm to birds, bats and marine mammals.

Thank you so much.

Sincerely,



Carol Frith

RECEIVED  
DEC -2 2004  
REGULATORY DEPARTMENT

581

Donald H. Leber *Tues 11/30/04*

Dear Karen Kirk Adams -

As A citizen - I support  
the Cape Wind Energy Project. The  
Cape needs power - now & in the future.  
cheap power - now is our chance  
to obtain it. The window of opportunity  
is now - it may never come again

Please Vote Yes In the  
EIS PROJECT

Thank you

Sincerely



64 Whitcomb Dr

Jamaica, MA 02675

RECEIVED  
DEC -2 2004  
ENCLOSURE

**Edmund T. Welch**

22 Azarian Road ~ Salem, NH 03079

Phone/Fax: 603 893 4536 ~ Email: [wauwinet\\_2000@yahoo.com](mailto:wauwinet_2000@yahoo.com)

---

Karen Adams, Project Manager  
Regulatory Division  
ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS  
696 Virginia Road  
Concord, MA 01742


Date 11/29/04

Dear Ms. Adams,

Please immediately extend the public comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Cape Wind project to 180 days. Any shorter time period is entirely insufficient to allow the public ample opportunity to provide input on such a lengthy and important document on a complex and controversial project.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter.

Sincerely,



RECEIVED

DEC -2 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION



## Cape Wind Proposes Big Dig in Horseshoe Shoal

We are fortunate as residents of Massachusetts to have the benefit of a short drive to Cape Cod. This scenic destination point offers beautiful beaches, and the horizon exceeds the expectation created by brochures and buzz words including water and views.

Cape Wind proposes that the views change, and that we pioneer alternative energy in the form of wind towers in Nantucket Sound. While alternative energy sources merit our attention, the location of this new resource and this new technology deserves scrutiny.

The magnitude and pitfalls of this project are in many ways comparable to the Big Dig.

The Big Dig involves 30 square miles in Boston.

Cape Wind's proposal involves 28 square miles within Nantucket Sound.

The Big Dig tunnel is underneath water, and within inches of an MBTA Red Line.

Cape Wind plans for Nantucket Sound include 130 windmills; each 425 ft. tall; within inches of Avian and marine life, with socioeconomic, navigational, and aviation impact expected.

The Big Dig is the largest construction project in history.

The Cape Wind proposed project is America's First Offshore Wind Farm.

The Big Dig is under the jurisdiction of the Federal Highway Administration.

Cape Wind is in the permitting process lead by the US Army Corps of Engineers and 16 other Federal and State agencies.

The Big Dig construction project represents 12 billion dollars in cost overruns.

The Horns Rev Wind farm in Denmark has 80 two megawatt turbines that have been returned to shore from the North Sea for repairs.


The Big Dig tunnels leak.

Cape Wind's proposal failed The Beacon Hill Institute Study, cost v. benefits test.

The otherwise pristine waters of the Cape are in peril should we allow the private developer, Cape Wind, to exploit the gaps in current ocean management policies. Some would say that exploitation is a buzz word that applies to the Big Dig. Cape Wind is proposing another Big Dig in Horseshoe Shoal.

Senator Robert O'Leary of the Cape and Island's District, who is the current Chairman of the Joint Committee on Energy, has requested that The Army Corps of Engineers extend the period for public comment on Cape Wind's wind tower proposal.

Barbara Durkin  
48 Moore Lane  
Northboro, MA 01532 Telephone (508) 393-1715



**Adams, Karen K NAE**


**From:** Doug Selsam [doug@selsam@adelphia.net]

**Sent:** Wednesday, December 01, 2004 2:03 PM

**To:** Energy, Wind

**Cc:** info@capewind.org

**Subject:** I have the answer




2600 P

Fullert


714-99

Doug@

The answer for offshore.  
 No rigid foundation needed.  
 No gearbox.  
 No crane needed for deployment.  
 No yaw control.  
 No rigid tower.  
 All the power using half the components.  
 Total moving parts: 1  
 Development funded by the California Energy Commission  
 Patented in the U.S. and patents pending in the U.S. and worldwide.



<http://www.selsam.com>



Thanks,  
Sincerely,  
Doug Selsam  
Selsam Innovations  
2600 Porter Ave. Unit B  
Fullerton, CA 92833  
<http://www.selsam.com>  
<http://www.superturbine.net>

497

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

Wayne F. Zervis

Date

11/27/04

Print Name

WAYNE F. ZERVIS

Address

445 RACK LANE

City

MANSTONS MILLS

State

MA

Zip

02648

RECEIVED  
DEC - 1 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

498

Dear Army Corps of Engineers: sacrificed for MINIMAL benefit to the public for maximum benefit to developers. A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

Alfred and Kathleen Souza

Date

11/28/04

Print Name

Alfred and Kathleen Souza

Address

628 Belmont St. Manchester N. H. 03104

City

and 13 Back Street, Nantucket MA. 02554

State

Zip

Others need to review the document thoroughly, from the various professional views. As Islanders, we value our fisheries, shellfish industries, birds, wildlife, scenery and SAFETY on sea and air. This ocean should not be

RECEIVED  
DEC - 1 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

499

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

*Nathan R. Allen*

Date 11/28/04

Print Name

NATHAN R. ALLEN, Jr

Address

9 Quince ST

City

NANTUCKET

State

MA

Zip

02554

RECEIVED

DEC - 1 - 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

500

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

*Roger Wellington*

Date 11/27/04

Print Name

Roger Wellington

Address

40 Garrison Lane

City

Osterville

State

MA

Zip

02655

RECEIVED

DEC - 1

REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

501

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Ery Largent Date 11/25/04  
Print Name 141 Haskell St. ERY LARGENT  
Address Beverly, MA  
City BEVERLY State MA Zip 01915

RECEIVED  
DEC - 1 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

502

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, David D. Worth Date 11/29/04  
Print Name DAVID D. WORTH  
Address 1 GROVE LANE BOX 392  
City NANTUCKET State MA Zip 02554

RECEIVED  
DEC - 1 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

503

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

Sheila K. Largay

Date

11/20/04

Print Name

Sheila K. Largay

RECEIVED

DEC - 1 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

Address

964 Seaview Ave

City

Osterville

State

MA

Zip

02655

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

504

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

David W. Cash

Date

11/28/2004

Print Name

DAVID W CASH

RECEIVED

DEC - 1 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

Address

545 Lumbert Mill Rd

City

Centerville

State

MA

Zip

02632

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

505

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, [Signature]

Print Name Robert Raley

Address P.O. Box 703

City Nantucket State MA

Date 11/29/04

RECEIVED  
DEC - 1 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

Zip 02554

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

506

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, [Signature]

Print Name Richard A. Hardy

Address 37 Ashmun Lane, P.O. Box 272

City Nantucket State MA

Date 11/28/04

RECEIVED  
DEC - 1 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

Zip 02554



Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

507

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Phyllis White Date 11/27/04  
Print Name Phyllis White  
Address 107 Shoreland Path  
City Falmouth State MA Zip 02536

RECEIVED

DEC - 1 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

508

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, RALPH & DONNA MIORANDI Date 11/27/04  
Print Name RALPH & DONNA MIORANDI  
Address 164 TOWER HILL ROAD  
City OSTERVILLE State MA Zip 02655

RECEIVED

DEC - 1 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

509

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, James Edward McCormack Date 11/24/04  
Print Name JAMES EDWARD MCCORMACK  
Address 20 BRENTWOOD RD  
City CHELMSFORD State MA Zip 01824  
ALSO - 18 WOODLAND AVE, OSTERVILLE, MA

RECEIVED  
DEC - 1 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

510

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Douglas N. Laxness Date 11/29/04  
Print Name Douglas N. Laxness  
Address 75 Scudder Rd.  
City Osterville, MA 02655 State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_

RECEIVED  
DEC - 1 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

511

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Gerald Epstein

Date 11/23/04

Print Name GERALD EPSTEIN

Address P.O. Box 498

City COTUIT

State MA

Zip 02635

RECEIVED  
DEC - 1 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

512

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, F. Lester Fraser

Date 11/28/04

Print Name F. LESTER FRASER

Address 35 LEONARD DR.

City OSTERVILLE

State MA

Zip 02556

RECEIVED  
DEC - 1 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

| ||| ||||| ||||| | | ||| ||||| ||||| || ||| | |||||

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

513

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Laura M. Worth Date 11/29/04  
Print Name LAURA M WORTH  
Address 1 Grove Lane P.O. Box 392  
City Nantucket State MA Zip 02554

RECEIVED  
DEC - 1 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

514

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Jacqueline Edwards Date 11/11/04  
Print Name Jacqueline Edwards  
Address 25 Hickory Lane  
City Nantucket State Ma Zip 02554


RECEIVED  
DEC - 1 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

515

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,

  
deborah

Date

10/30/04

Print Name

JAMES MILLS

RECEIVED

DEC - 1 - 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

Address

Box 2110

City

Osterville

State

MA

Zip


02655

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

516

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely,



Date

10/26/04

Print Name

JAMES MILLS

RECEIVED

DEC - 1 - 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

Address

Box 2110

City

Osterville

State

MA

Zip

02655

Dear Army Corps of Engineers:

517

A 60-day review period is unreasonable to adequately review the massive 4,000-page Cape Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. I respectfully request that you extend the review period to 180 days in order for the public to be as best informed as possible and provide you with thoughtful and unhurried input on this precedent-setting project.

Sincerely, Joanne Avery

Print Name Joanne Avery

Address 18 Hidden Lane

City Osterville

State MA

Date 11/29/04

RECEIVED  
DEC - 1 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION  
Zip 02655

**Adams, Karen K NAE**

---

**From:** Bill Cantor [bill@mattawhatzit.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 01, 2004 6:27 AM  
**To:** Energy, Wind  
**Subject:** Nantucket Sound wind farm

Please register a boaters vote AGAINST the wind farm.

There is nothing in this for those of us who live near, look out over the sound or sail its waters.

1) The wind farm is a private enterprise trying to get use of a public resource for nothing and giving back no benefit to the area residents.

If they told us we'd get free electricity, that might be one thing, but they get all the benefit.

2) Those of us who sail these waters know that very often there is little to no wind at night.

Their business plan is based on inaccurate wind production numbers.

3) If it is allowed to be built, they should be required to post a PERFORMANCE BOND that would pay for the removal of their equipment.

Vote me AGAINST the Wind Farm.

Capt. William Cantor  
33 Main St.  
Mattapoisett, MA 02739

**Adams, Karen K NAE**

---

**From:** Lucy Edwards [lcedwards@metrocast.net]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 01, 2004 7:11 AM  
**To:** Energy, Wind  
**Subject:** Wind farms

As a member of the Northwood NH Board of Selectmen I have recently heard of a proposal to consider wind generators on the top of the small mountain that rises substantially above our town. While it is only 1100 feet at its peak, it stands well above the surrounds and has almost constant wind in any weather. I live on the side of this mountain. So I can speak both as a town resident and a town official (although not speaking for the board as a whole) to say that I would support wind turbines in my town. Any renewable source of energy would be most welcome.

Therefore I can support the wind turbines proposed off Cape Cod. We are in dire need of making a start on reducing our dependence on fossil fuels. To balance the small environmental costs of the wind turbines against the costs of global warming is, for me, a non-brainer.

Thank you,

Lucy C. Edwards  
177 Old Mountain Rd.  
Northwood, NH 03261  
603-942-7241  
Lcedwards@metrocast.net



**Adams, Karen K NAE**

---

**From:** Jack Jackson [Jack@On-Message.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 01, 2004 8:08 AM  
**To:** Energy, Wind  
**Subject:** Support for the Cape Wind Project

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to register my strong support for moving forward with the Cape Wind project. Although I'm pleased the Army Corps of Engineers' recent study reaffirms earlier research showing the project represents a net positive to our region, I'm keenly aware of some parties' continued resistance to the wind farm and wish to counter their objections.

Extensive data on meteorologic and oceanographic effects, as well as regional economic benefits, all point to compelling reasons for proceeding with the Cape Wind program. Just as many people who called Massachusetts home during Colonial times assumed leadership roles in the American revolution, we have the opportunity to break new ground for our country today in being among the first to commit to energy-independence and environmentally-sound actions.

I appreciate the opportunity to make my voice heard.

Sincerely,

Jacob Jackson  
48 Canavan Circle  
Needham, MA 02492

**Adams, Karen K NAE**

---

**From:** Lisa Forte Doyle [LForteDoyle@Chatham.k12.ma.us]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 01, 2004 9:22 AM  
**To:** Energy, Wind  
**Subject:** wind farm in Nantucket Sound

To Whom it May Concern at the Army Corps of Engineers,

I am a resident of Brewster, Mass and teach at Chatham High School in nearby Chatham. I am fully supportive of the wind farm proposal in Nantucket Sound. I have traveled to Denmark several times as I have a good friend in Copenhagen. My family has always loved the Danish windmills; they are so lithe and graceful looking. Our country desperately needs to strengthen our renewable energy availability and use. Please don't let the rich few dominate the needs of the rest of us. Let us be the first in our country to try this technology.

Thank you,

Lisa Forte Doyle  
651 Harwich Road  
Brewster, MA 02631

Adams, Karen K NAE

---

**From:** stevesfishing@adelphia.net  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 01, 2004 9:57 AM  
**To:** Energy, Wind  
**Subject:** In Favor of the Wind Farms

I would like to take the opportunity to state that as a resident of Cape Cod I am in favor of the Wind Farm Project. With everything over the Bridges being more expensive and the State being willing to add to our congestion via the Sagamore Flyover, I cannot see why so many insignificant obstacles are being thrown in the face of a project that seems to possess nothing but positives for a new source of energy from a cost and inexhaustible source point of view. The positive what if's far out weigh the negative what if's.

I have seen the proposed models, and the impact, on the folks with the million dollar views and they are insignificant considering the normal fog and haze that cover the area. I could be a little more sympathetic if these same folks did not seem so closely linked to the vanishing access that Cape Codders have seen over the last 25 years to our shoreline. Most of whom only inhabit our beautiful part of the world when the climate is perfect 6 to 8 weeks a year. The rest of us work to pay the bills and have a genuine stake in the long term on Cape Cod.

From an ecological and international political point of view I would prefer to see increased domestic sources like the wind farm as opposed to reliance on countries that hold us hostage to their oil supplies. Not to mention if the wind farms decrease the risk of future oil spills around Cape Cod and our valuable Ocean resources by the smallest amount that has to be a huge plus.

Lastly I had heard that the wind farm placement would disrupt some commercial fishing. Having fished most of the cape for 30 plus years this location would be one of the last on my list of hot spots. I can't believe anyone is making a living fishing the proposed site. I have however had tremendous success fishing in the Gulf of Mexico around the Oil Rigs. It seems to me the Wind Farm would have a positive impact on the fishing in the area providing shelter for bait fish and the ability for the sea bed (mostly barren) to flourish.

I would like to close by saying it seems more good can come from such a project and that much of the opposition in my opinion is political and hyped up in nature.

The Cape is in many ways a shining example of how things can be. Why not make the Cape a symbol and success story of the cleanest most accessible, abundant, and reliable source of renewable energy.

Yours  
Steve Hamilton  
Bourne, MA

Steve Hamilton

525  
523

**Adams, Karen K NAE**

---

**From:** Rob Reynolds [robtgb@cape.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 01, 2004 10:01 AM  
**To:** Energy, Wind  
**Subject:** Natucket Sound

Karen Hughes,  
This is an (extremely) negative response to approving the permit to Cape Wind. The largest wind plant in the world just offshore Cape Cod? You've got to be kidding. You (personnally) can't ruin that vista for the rest of us.  
It would be much more effective to reduce air pollutoin by enforcing the rules we had regarding fossil plant (Canal Electric).  
You should feel incredibly guilty if your group approves it.  
Rob Reynolds  
54 Wigeon Rd.  
Falmouth, MA 02540

~~524~~  
524

**Adams, Karen K NAE**

---

**From:** Skpabc@aol.com

**Sent:** Wednesday, December 01, 2004 10:03 AM

**To:** Energy, Wind

**Subject:** Cape Wind

No solution is perfect, but we've simply got to try new programs to develop sustainable energy.  
Please give this one a shot!

Thanks,  
S. Prince  
Westport, CT

12/1/2004

**Adams, Karen K NAE**

---

**From:** Deb Bruss [dbruss@mcttelecom.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 01, 2004 10:02 AM  
**To:** Energy, Wind  
**Subject:** Cape Wind Project

Dear USACE:

Please make the Cape Wind Project known to the rest of the country. It's success will affect more than just the residents of Cape Cod. The rest of our nation needs to know that there are alternatives to our oil driven economy and foreign policy. Windmills and all their drawbacks are a far site better than melted polar glacial water drowning cities such as New York and Miami. Thank you.

Sincerely,  
Deborah Bruss  
369 Center Rd  
Bradford NH 03221

12/1/2004

**Adams, Karen K NAE**

---

**From:** Don Hayward [anonymous6403@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 01, 2004 10:28 AM  
**To:** Energy, Wind  
**Subject:** Wind Farm Location

Karen Adams  
Army Corps of Engineers

Dear Ms. Adams:

As a founding member of Clean Power Now, congratulations on the production of a very comprehensive document in the D.E.I.S.

My bias is obvious by my membership in CPN but I recognize the opposition leadership as people with their own visual impact concerns and/or the oil interests using the visual impact as a smoke screen.

Also as a Bourne resident having a Grandfather who worked on both bridges over the Canal, I am sure that there were concerns over the visual impact of those structures and of the Canal project as a whole.

The detractors of the Army Corps have forgotten the successes of the Manhattan Project and many others that were cutting edge technology at the time.

I support your political Independence and science based philosophy in this report and as an independent agency of Government.

Don C. Hayward  
PO Box 1005  
Monument Beach, Ma. 02553  
508-759-8974

---

Do you Yahoo!?

Yahoo! Mail - You care about security. So do we.

[http://promotions.yahoo.com/new\\_mail](http://promotions.yahoo.com/new_mail)

**Adams, Karen K NAE**

---

**From:** Melissa Chappell Burns [mburns@brynmawr.edu]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 01, 2004 11:12 AM  
**To:** Energy, Wind

My name is Melissa Burns and I live at 326 W. Durham St., Phila., PA 19119.

I've been following with interest the development of Cape Wind. I believe that alternative energy is the only way forward for a viable future and that we're lucky to have the resource of wind in abundance.

I've listened to the arguments against Cape Wind's proposal to harness wind for energy and I don't think they're legitimate. Aesthetics are not a substantive concern given all we've got to lose by not supporting alternative energy. I understand that your report put to rest a number of ill-founded fears, except for the concern that birds would die by flying into the turbines.

It's a shame about the birds, but birds die all the time flying into windowpanes, getting hit by cars, etc., and we don't let those untimely avian demises get in the way of our going forth. I would hate to think that a clean-energy future won't happen because we are overly concerned about birds and not concerned enough about people.

Thank you for taking the time to read my comments.

Melissa Chappell Burns  
Director, Prospect Research and Management  
Bryn Mawr College  
610.526.5128 P  
610.526.7378 F  
mburns@brynmawr.edu



**Adams, Karen K NAE**

---

**From:** Kris Kinsley [kriskins@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 01, 2004 12:22 PM  
**To:** Energy, Wind  
**Subject:** Cape Wind comments

To Whom it may concern:

I wanted to submit comments from my husband, Pat Woodley Hancock, and myself, Kris Kinsley Hancock regarding the proposal for the Cape Wind Farm project as we will not be able to attend the Dec. 8th meeting on Nantucket.

I have been coming to Nantucket since the 60's, moving here year-round in the 80's; Pat has lived here year-round since the 70's. We're very concerned about this wind farm proposal for many reasons.

**Fog and travel:**

Pat, having piloted aircraft to and from the island as a private, recreational pilot is very aware of the challenging air traffic conditions for aircraft that may emerge from these wind towers. The fog out here can be intense and dense; sometimes aircraft get out of flight paths unknowingly. Having so many towers close to where planes may fly at low altitudes is not wise. The same is true for birds. There are so many migratory birds that fly this way that could potentially be harmed by the towers. The ships that travel in this area could also have their safety compromised in such weather conditions.

**Rough weather and stability:**

Assuming the towers are built in a way that they can withstand the rough weather out here, there is still the possibility that they cannot withstand the changes that could compromise their stability. For years, people have tried to build up the shoreline and put various man-made structures in place to protect the land and their homes. The ocean shifts, currents change and stability of structures is undermined. Shoals move. Ice has built up in the bay during the past two winters--ice floes can be very powerful in moving items anchored in oceans. Wind towers built in such conditions are subject to having their stability undermined. They could then topple in the ocean and become very disruptive to ocean travelers, man and sea creature alike. Removal would likely be very expensive and time-consuming.

**Aesthetics and noise:**

Having recently traveled to Sweden, where wind towers of various sizes already exist, we have seen how they disrupt the land/seascape. Flying over Denmark and Sweden, it was amazing how the wind towers stood out in terms of height and sight as we flew over them even at 30,000 feet. The wind towers that were on land were noisy as well--we'd drive by an area of wind towers and be able to hear them with the car windows up. Interestingly, we did not see many birds around areas where groups of wind towers stood, although they were present in other areas.

**Preservation:**

The Cape and Islands are special and are visited/inhabited by historians, artists and nature lovers (as well as other types of people). There is a reason this area is attractive to such people. The landscape is unique and the views are awe-inspiring. Having huge wind towers changing so much of the vista would not be welcome by many who appreciate these aspects of life out here.

Cost vs. advantages:

Yes, alternative energy sources are a good idea. Yes, there are times when change is warranted. Thinking carefully about the placement of major structures and the lives, human and animal, that could be affected is very important when considering implementing major changes to an environment. What are the benefits vs. the costs, both financially and in terms of quality of life that may result? We have heard that if the towers are constructed, we, as Nantucket dwellers, will benefit very little financially and lose out significantly in the quality of life category.

Questions:

Can the wind towers be located elsewhere? Land would seem more appropriate than out in the ever-changing sea.

Who is the power for?

Should a private company be given land to make so many changes to so many lives--whose land (sea) is it to give?

Does the proposition make sense financially and environmentally?

Who/what will be negatively impacted? Will compensation be granted?

Will legal battles ensue? What repercussions may occur?

How thoroughly have planning studies been done taking into account the many variables and a realistic picture of the effects of weather?

Who will maintain the towers and how will that affect the financial viability of them?

If the project goes through and then is deemed a failure, who will be accountable for removal of the towers?

I would hope that very careful consideration to these and other issues regarding the wind towers are carefully considered prior to permission being given for their construction. Pat and I would like our opinions regarding this issue to be shared with those who are making decisions regarding this project. Given what we understand about this proposal, we genuinely hope that it does not occur.

Thank you for your time,

Kris Kinsley Hancock and Pat Woodley Hancock  
21 Skyline Drive  
Nantucket, MA 02554

**Adams, Karen K NAE**

---

**From:** Harriet Tower [harltower@msn.com]

**Sent:** Wednesday, December 01, 2004 12:36 PM

**To:** Energy, Wind

We own a cottage on the Vineyard Sound in Falmouth. We are supportive of clean energy and less dependency of fossil fuels which pollute the environment and which have polluted our politics and made us vulnerable to other nations. Please allow this wind farm to generate the energy of the next century. Harriet Lane Tower

12/1/2004

**Adams, Karen K NAE**

---

**From:** David Arfa and Kim Erslev [erslarfa@valinet.com]

**Sent:** Wednesday, December 01, 2004 12:26 PM

**To:** Energy, Wind

**Subject:** cape wind

I am writing in support of the Cape Wind Project. I visited Denmark in 1999 and my breath was taken away by the awesome beauty of their windmills- on the water and inland. They are inspiring, quiet and providing clean energy to Denmark. I wholeheartedly support them on the Cape. I think everyone will find, as they did in Denmark, that their elegance draws people from all over the world, and that their energy is enjoyed by many.

Barbara Kim Erslev  
Architect and Landscape Designer  
Shelburne Falls, MA

12/1/2004

**Adams, Karen K NAE**

---

**From:** Bob Fabian [bfabian@solar-works.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 01, 2004 12:55 PM  
**To:** Energy, Wind  
**Subject:** comments on Cape Wind project

Hello,

I'm speaking as a concerned citizen living in Boston. The driving force behind this project is global warming. I will not beat that drum here, suffice it to say that the National Academy of Sciences reviewed and confirmed the findings from earlier and on-going studies.

Your studies have allied any environmental affects. I have been to the Cape to survey Horseshoe Shoals to see how serious the aesthetic effect would be on the area. And I find them minimal.

I understand that the coastal land owners on Martha's Vineyard, Nantucket and the Cape may not agree with my appraisal, but in the larger picture, their concerns are very petty compared to the benefits of this project.

Thank you,

Bob Fabian

**Adams, Karen K NAE**

---

**From:** Steven Croopnick [scroopnick@draper.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 01, 2004 1:36 PM  
**To:** Energy, Wind  
**Subject:** Cape Wind Project

Attn: Karen Adams, Project Manager, Regulatory Division

Dear Ms. Adams: This is a request to extend the comment period from 60 days to 180 days for the Cape Wind DEIS to allow adequate time to review the 4,000 page document.

Thank you,

Steven Croopnick  
117 Baldpate Hill Rd.  
Newton, MA 02459

**Adams, Karen K NAE**

---

**From:** mary keller [maryharp@cape.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 01, 2004 1:22 PM  
**To:** Energy, Wind  
**Subject:** Questions about Windfarm on Nantucket

My biggest concerns about the proposed windfarm project in Nantucket Sound have to do with Possible Failure of the WindFarm. Large numbers of these windmills sitting in ocean water buffeted by extreme salt and wind conditions are fairly untested. What if they continually break, causing eventual failure of this project. What then? who will pay to remove them and put the sound back the way it was? What promises can be made that total removal would occur? i repeat, these windmills in ocean water seem to be an experiment, and this is a huge project installed with permanency in mind. This makes me very uneasy as a Nantucket resident.

Mary Keller

P.O. Box 22

Siasconset, MA 02564

508-228-6002

**Adams, Karen K NAE**

---

**From:** Mike Roche [acktax@nantucket.net]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 01, 2004 3:38 PM  
**To:** Energy, Wind  
**Subject:** Cape wind farm

Since we will be unable to attend your meeting on Nantucket next week, I want to take this opportunity to say that we are 100% in favor of the wind farm.

In these times when we are dependent on expensive imported oil and gas, we should take a lesson from the Europeans who have extensive wind farms, working quite successfully. We complain about burning fossil fuels and air pollution, and this is an excellent opportunity to show the country what can be done with non-polluting, renewable, clean wind energy, especially here in the Northeast.

We think, rather than be harmful to the tourist industry, it will become a curiosity and will attract tourists.

Welcome to the 21st century, and welcome to the Cape wind farm.

Sincerely

Michael and Jane Roche  
6 Keel Lane  
Nantucket





**ECODESIGN, Inc.**

**EAST:** Flagship Wharf #506  
Charlestown Navy Yard  
Boston, MA 02129  
Ph (617) 241-9006  
Fx (617) 241-7557  
Cell (970) 948-8822  
sscutter@ECODESIGN.com

Architecture  
Urban Design  
Environmental Planning  
Production Design  
Film, Video & Illustration  
Property Develop & Management

November 29, 2004  
Governor Mitt Romney, Commonwealth of Massachusetts  
Office of the Governor, Room 360 / Fax (617) 727-9725  
Boston, MA 02133

CC: *ARMY CORP OF ENGINEERS*  
*ATTN: KAREN K. ADAMS*

**Re:**

**"Comprehensive Coastal Zoning" and "Massachusetts Alternative Energy Technology and Planning Initiative": Real Answers on Proposed Power Plant?**

Dear Governor Romney,

Thank you for your strong, straightforward and reasoned stand against the proposed Wind Power Plant placement in Nantucket Sound.

Clearly, any "thinking person" is in favor of Alternative Energy, but...not for a 40 story high, 24 square mile industrial complex, plunked in the middle of the National Treasure of Nantucket Sound. Nor are they for the use of already outdated turbines, that are untested in our maritime conditions, on an un-zoned, unregulated Federal "land-grab" site.

Knee-jerk environmentalism and fears of foreign oil dependency are allowing the developer of the Nantucket Sound Energy Plant to use the generic arguments for Alternative Energy solutions of all kinds to miss-lead people into believing that his proposal is the only alternative. Using this combination of the "generic benefits of alternative energy" and "my project is the only alternative" approach, this developer has been consistently able to dodge the real questions put forth and to avoid exploration of viable, lower impact (but less profitable) alternatives.

Instead of allowing ourselves to be diverted by his constant repeat of these generic wind energy benefits, can we require the developer to give serious answers to real questions in a valid Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)?

**People who protest this proposal are for Alternative Energy, but seriously question:**

- Is this the right Site---in a National Natural Treasure comparable to our great National Parks like the Grand Canyon as opposed to an industrial, military or municipal site? (*Secretary Douglas Foy's desired "World Class Park System" in conjunction with "Comprehensive Coastal Zoning"*)
- Is this the right Technology or should this massive (40 story high / multi-gallon oil storage, etc.) equipment be tested on land first and developed for greater efficiency and safety? Shortly new technologies and computer enhancing will offer capabilities for higher production in lower wind ranges. (*"Alternative Energy Technology and Planning Initiative"*)
- Is this the right Time or should our obsolete northeast electric power distribution grid be updated first? (*Alternative Energy Technology and Planning Initiative*)
- Is this the right Size? An un-tested, "largest ever" off-shore commercial scale project as opposed to phased or smaller, decentralized local or municipal based installations that


would benefit the Cape and Islands area directly. (*Alternative Energy Technology and Planning Initiative*)

- Is it right for Federal land (?) with State jurisdictions in dispute to be turned over to a private developer for profit without zoning, regulations and payment policies in place? (*"Comprehensive Coastal Zoning" and standard EIS requirement for confirmed undisputed site survey.*)
- How is the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, with Army Corp of Engineers as the determining agency using the developer's own consultant research materials, a viable process? Who selects alternative sites to be reviewed and do they include onshore and de-centralized alternatives? (*Need valid Environmental Impact Statement through "Comprehensive Coastal Zoning" process.*)
- How does the visual destruction (turbines appearing as posts in a giant chain link fence with struts, lights, horns, signs, etc.) of the main attraction of Nantucket Sound really affect the major industry of the Cape and Islands...i.e.: Tourism? (*"Comprehensive Coastal Zoning", also the full-scale turbine mock-up was never installed.*)
- Navigation and Security will be difficult (both visual and radar) with the pollution of shapes and the myriad of lights of all colors especially at night and in fog. Navigation will be impeded by structures, and no doubt eventually be halted by the Coast Guard for the thousands of small 3-4' draft boats that pass over this location. Can the developer guarantee free access and security to our waters? (*"Comprehensive Coastal Zoning"*)
- Does the risk of the many projected, but unquantifiable impacts, related to navigation, security, fish, fishing, fowl, tourism, safety, historic resources, variable output, oil storage spill, etc. create a "critical mass" of unknown, but irreversible, impacts that should require an alternative land based site for testing of this technology? (*"Comprehensive Coastal Zoning" and Alternative Energy Technology and Planning Initiative*)

The selection of "Alternative Sites" reviewed in the EIS is an extremely tricky section for the developers and the EIS reviewing agencies. If they determine that there are no viable comparable or acceptable alternative sites onshore as well as off, then they are in effect saying that the proposed technology is not a viable on-going Alternative Energy source in which to invest. Inability to reproduce these power installations would be extremely damaging to all proponents of Alternative Energy. The first Alternative Energy projects must be successful---and repeatable---if they are to truly reduce foreign-based oil dependency and claim the benefits of cleaner air.

A determination of the potential success through reproducibility of the proposed energy plant can only be determined by analysis of the questions above through "*Comprehensive Coastal Zoning*" in conjunction with a "*Alternative Energy Technology and Planning Initiative*". These initiatives are also appropriate to the science, technology and planning resources and maritime heritage of Massachusetts.

Sincerely,



Sherrie S. Cutler, A.I.A.  
ECODESIGN, Inc., President  
Environmental Planning and Architecture  
sscutter@ecodesign.com  
Cell (970) 948-8822 or Ph (617) 241-9006

FROM

MARY NATURIAN  
FLORA NATURIAN  
425 EAST 63RD ST  
NEW YORK NY 10021

000027

67 Toledo St  
E. Falmouth, MA  
02536

RECEIVED

DEC 1 1971

TO Army Corps of Engineers  
Concord, MA 01742  
Attn: Karen Adams Project Manager  
DEAR Committee:

We are very interested & pleased to support the Alliance To Protect Nantucket Sound. We have spent 41 years on Cape & have a cottage on the Nantucket Sound. Our family begs your Committee not to destroy our beautiful Cape & the Cape Wind Project. If you do it will be large, industrialize, and no longer will birds & tourists come to our lovely beaches.

The Pilgrims first landed on these shores along here. To go with this environmental disaster will be the American (the Cape Wind Project).

When you meet, Remember the Pilgrims, and President John F. Kennedy, passed, Preservation Shores & Waters. Keep America The Beautiful.

C.C. The Alliance To  
Protect Nantucket  
Sound

Sen. Ted Kennedy  
Gov. Royce A. DiSanti

Sincerely,  
Flora Naturian

**ADA M. BRUEGGEMAN**

---

727 Main St. Apt. G2  
Osterville, Ma 02655-1936

November 29, 2004

Karen Adams, Project Manager,  
Regulatory Division  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
696 Virginia Rd.  
Concord, Ma 01742

Dear Karen Adams,

I would like to add my name to those who oppose the Wind Farm in Nantucket Sound.

It's called Wind Farm, I call it "manufacturing" the ocean.

I feel the size of the operation would threaten wildlife, airplanes and boating.

Two sides to the discussion;

- 1) The Wind Farm would provide all of the Cape electricity needs.
- 2) The Wind Farm would provide less than 2% of the Cape electricity needs.
- 3) There is a concern about noise. How can there not be with the size of this operation?

The beaches serve a great need for the people. Some come to sit on the beach, look out at the ocean, have that calm feeling come over them and forget the cares of the day.

Also great for the children to dig in the sand, splash in the water, have fun in the colder months, and walk the beach.

I'll close with that old saying "Once the camel gets his nose under the Tent"

Will this mean an influx of manufacturing because the electrical source is there?

We need an extension of the comment period from 60 days to 180 days.

Sincerely yours,



RECEIVED

DEC -1 2004

REGULATORY DIVISION

Lesley H. Miller  
448 Weir Road  
Yarmouth Port, MA 02675-2525

November 28, 2004

U. S. Army Corps of Engineers  
New England District  
Cape Wind Energy EIS Project  
Attn: Karen Kirk Adams  
696 Virginia Road  
Concord, MA 01742

RECEIVED

NOV 30 11 03 AM

NOV 30 11 03 AM

Dear Ms. Adams:

Having read the Executive Summary of the DEIS on the Cape Wind project, and studied the computerized views published in the DEIS, I wish to reiterate my support for the project.

There seems to be no viable argument against the project other than relatively minor changes in the view from shore on a clear day or night.

Whether one sees the view as improved or impaired by the project, it is surely less intrusive than the unending vistas of utility poles wherever one goes on the Cape and Islands. We have seen the utility poles for so long that we tend to ignore them and "airbrush" them from our memory of cherished views. We accept them because we want to be connected to electric supplies and telephone service.

I believe that in time the wind park will also be "airbrushed" from our treasured views of the Sound while it reduces air and water pollution and our dependence on foreign oil and dampens the increase in cost of power.

Thank you for taking this letter into consideration.

Sincerely



Lesley H. Miller

lesleymiller@comcast.net

Karen Adams  
Project Manager, Regulatory Division  
ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS  
N.E. District  
696 Virginia Road  
Concord, MA 01742

November 2004

Dear Ms. Adams,

Please immediately extend the public comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Cape Wind project to 180 days. Any shorter time period is entirely insufficient to allow the public ample opportunity to provide input on such a lengthy and important document on a complex and controversial project.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

*Mary Ellen Hayden*  
Mary Ellen Hayden  
60 Cheek Road  
Cotuit MA 02635

RECEIVED  
DEC -1 2004  
REGULATORY DIVISION

Karen Adams  
Project Manager, Regulatory Division  
ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS  
N.E. District  
696 Virginia Road  
Concord, MA 01742


November 2004

Dear Ms. Adams,

Please immediately extend the public comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Cape Wind project to 180 days. Any shorter time period is entirely insufficient to allow the public ample opportunity to provide input on such a lengthy and important document on a complex and controversial project.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

  
Robert F. Hayden IV  
60 Cheek Road  
Cotuit MA 02635

RECEIVED

DEC - 1 2004

COMMUNICATIONS SECTION

Comment Sheet  
On Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)  
For the proposal for an Offshore Wind Project  
In Nantucket Sound

RECEIVED  
DEC 1 - 2011  
1021-1-1021

Name: JAMES REED

Address: 350 SCUDDER Ave  
Nyanmis MA  
02601

Phone Number (Please include area code): 508-771-4974

Email Address: JIMCREED@YAHOO.COM

Please state your questions/comments in the space below:

ASSUMING THE WINDMILLS ARE INSTALLED  
WHAT BECOMES OF ANY SEA BED CHANGES  
THAT MAY NOW BE EFFECTED BY THE TIDAL  
FLOW AROUND THE SUPPORT STRUCTURES ?

WHAT HAPPENS IF INCREASED SHOALING OCCURS ?  
IN THE WINDMILL FIELD ?

WHAT HAPPENS IF A SAND ISLAND IS CREATED  
DOES THIS THEN BECOME MASS STATE LAND ?  
IF NOT - WHY NOT ?

WHAT RULES HAS THE CORP INSTITUTED FOR THIS  
PROJECT? GOVERNING THE WIND FARM ?

PLEASE COMMENT ON THE HORNS RZU Project  
IN DENMARK • which recently underwent major  
dismantlement AND THE IMPACT ON ELECTRICAL  
COSTS OF THE PROJECT & ADDITIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL  
Impact.

Please fold this questionnaire in half, affix two stickers or pieces of tape,  
and mail it to the address listed on the other side.



Comment Sheet  
On Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)  
For the proposal for an Offshore Wind Project  
In Nantucket Sound

Name: David Nash

Address: P.O. Box 3254  
35 Deacon Vincent Way  
Edgartown, MA 02539

Phone Number (Please include area code): 508-627-4867

Email Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Please state your questions/comments in the space below:

I strongly support an extension to the  
public comment period to 180 days as  
well as a postponement of the public  
hearings until after the holidays

I have requested a copy of the ED  
myself and it has not been received  
as of 11/19 affording me hardly any time  
at all to review the report.

As a former government environmental  
regulator I find it somewhat impractical to  
impose such short time limits on the public

Please fold this questionnaire in half, affix two stickers or pieces of tape,  
and mail it to the address listed on the other side.